

# **Webinar of 20 July 2023**

## **on the key elements of the Ex-post evaluation**

### **Home Affairs Funds 2014-2020**

#### **Consolidated Background Note – October 2023**

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Contents .....	1
Introduction.....	3
Aim of the note.....	3
Structure of the note .....	3
Legal basis.....	3
1. Planning the evaluation .....	4
1.1. Legal deadlines for the ex-post evaluation of AMIF and ISF .....	4
1.2. Selecting the evaluation experts .....	4
2. Scope and focus of the ex-post evaluation .....	5
2.1. Aim.....	5
2.2. Scope and granularity .....	5
2.3. Synergies with the Mid-Term Evaluation 2021-2027 .....	5
3. Main differences and points of attention in the implementation and reporting .....	6
3.1. Reporting on the evaluation and template .....	6
3.2. Data for the ex-post evaluation of the period 2014-2020 .....	8
3.3. Methods and Techniques – some additional recommendations for the <i>ex post</i> evaluation .....	10
3.3.1. Evaluation Matrix and Indicative Judgement Criteria.....	10
3.3.2. Focus on the assessment of the effects .....	12
3.3.3. Points of attention on the FAQs .....	14
4. Procedural aspects and next steps .....	14
5. Reasons for returning an <i>ex post</i> evaluation report .....	15
Annex I – Evaluation questions, sub-questions and indicative judgement criteria.....	17
AMIF 17	
ISF-BV .....	23
ISF-P 25	

Annex II – Indicators’ definitions, sources, baselines (meta-data).....	27
Indicators by specific objective – AMIF.....	27
S01: Asylum and reception .....	27
S02: Legal Migration and Integration .....	37
S03: Return.....	44
S04: Solidarity .....	49
Horizontal indicators .....	50
Indicators by specific objectives – ISF .....	50
SO1: Visa .....	51
SO2: Border.....	54
SO5: Crime.....	62
SO6: Risk and crisis .....	77
Horizontal indicators .....	79

## INTRODUCTION

### Aim of the note

This background note aims to complement the general information on evaluation and monitoring provided in the document *Guidance on the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for AMIF and ISF*, shared in May 2017, and used as a basis for the interim evaluation report. This note aims at providing the complementary information needed on the aim, scope, planning, data, implementation and reporting of the ex-post evaluation of the National Programmes for AMIF and ISF. Whenever no mention in contrario is made in this note, the original methodological guidance needs to be followed. The current document provides elements that are specific to the ex-post evaluation.

### Structure of the note

The structure of the note reflects the fact that it only covers the main differences or points of attention that should be considered for the ex-post evaluation *vis-à-vis* the interim evaluation for the 14-20 programming period.

In Section 1, the main aspects for an appropriate planning of the ex-post evaluation are recalled.

In Section 2, the scope, aim and interrelation with the Mid-Term evaluation for the 2021-2027 period are discussed.

Section 3 highlights the main points of attention and differences compared to the Guidance on the Common Monitoring and Evaluation framework from the perspective of the implementation, data on and reporting of the ex-post evaluation.

Section 4 provides some information on procedural aspects and the concrete next steps.

Section 5 describes the possible reasons for returning an ex post evaluation report.

Annex I presents a non-exhaustive overview of the evaluation questions and sub-questions based on the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 207/2017, and some indicative judgement criteria that the responsible authorities can consider when drafting the terms of reference for the ex-post evaluations.

Annex II contains the updated meta-data (definitions, sources, etc.) for the relevant common output, result and impact indicators.

### Legal basis

**The Horizontal Regulation defines the main requirements for the monitoring and evaluation of the 14-20 AMIF and ISF programmes.** These include, amongst others:

- the need to define a Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (art. 55(3)), for which the Commission was empowered in line with article 58;
- the responsibility of the MS to allow the monitoring and evaluation of the programmes by the Commission (art. 55(5));
- the responsibility of the MS to gather and make available the data for the evaluation of the programmes (art. 56(2));
- the requirements for the independence of the evaluators (art. 56(3));
- the visibility requirements (art. 56(4));
- the deadlines for the evaluations (art. 57(1)).

However, it is the [Commission Delegated Regulation \(EU\) 207/2017](#) that defines the common monitoring and evaluation framework (CMEF) for the AMIF and ISF, including specific evaluation questions and sub-questions to be addressed by both the MS and the Commission in their

**evaluations, as well as the data to be used in this context.** The Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 207/2017 also stresses the need for a uniform approach, to the extent possible, in order to enable an integrated analysis at EU level. In this vein, article 2(1) indicates that the Member State evaluations should follow the templates developed by the Commission, and they need to use the indicators defined in Annex III and IV (art. 2(2)) of the Delegated Regulation.

## **1. PLANNING THE EVALUATION**

### **1.1. Legal deadlines for the ex-post evaluation of AMIF and ISF**

The legal basis of the AMIF and ISF states that the Commission must submit an ex-post evaluation report on the implementation of the AMIF and ISF to the European Parliament, to the Council, to the European Economic and Social Committee, and to the Committee of the Regions by 30 June 2025 (Art. 57(2)(b) of the Horizontal Regulation).

In addition, it establishes that the Member States shall submit to the Commission “*an ex-post evaluation report on the effects of actions under their national programmes by 31 December 2024*” (Art. 57(1)(b) of the Horizontal Regulation).

The Commission’s ex post evaluation of AMIF and ISF will build to a great extent on the ex post evaluation reports submitted by each Member State to the Commission by 31 December 2024. It will also include an evaluation of the Union Actions and the Emergency Assistance projects.

The deadline for the submission of the Commission's report is extremely tight, considering the parallel exercise to be carried out for the two Funds and the many administrative steps prior to publication of the evaluation reports. For this reason, it is crucial that Member States prepare and submit their national evaluation reports on time. Member States are also kindly asked to transmit to the Commission data stored at the Member State level<sup>1</sup> by September 2024.

### **1.2. Selecting the evaluation experts**

As in the case of the mid-term evaluation, the ex-post evaluation must be carried out by experts who are functionally independent from the Responsible Authorities, the Audit Authorities and the Delegated Authorities (art. 56(3) HR). This implies that the Member States have the choice to entrust the evaluation to external experts (contractors), or to an internal but functionally independent body. Under the second option, these experts may be affiliated to an autonomous public institution responsible for the monitoring, evaluation and audit of public administration services. The hierarchical independence of the evaluators needs to be assessed and ensured. This information must be included in the report submitted to the Commission, as part of the introduction.

Depending on the option selected by each Member State, procurement may or may not be necessary. In both cases it is essential to set up a detailed plan and to write precise Terms of Reference (hereafter referred to as the ToR).

The Member States should start the process to select external evaluators as soon as possible, and no later than October-November 2023. This will enable them to select the experts by December 2023. The ex post evaluation study should start no later than January-February 2024.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to section 3.2 for the details on the scope of this exercise and the data transmission arrangements in SFC2014.

## **2. SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE EX-POST EVALUATION**

### **2.1. Aim**

As per the legal basis, the aim of the ex-post evaluation is to review the effects of the actions under the national programmes. The detailed questions to be addressed by the MS (and the Commission) are defined in the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 207/2017 on the common monitoring and evaluation framework provided for in Regulation (EU) No 514/2014.

An overview of the questions, sub-questions and indicative judgement criteria is included in Annex I below.

### **2.2. Scope and granularity**

The evaluation covers the entire national programme.

Whilst it formally covers the whole 14-20 implementation period, certain parts of the analysis can build upon the findings of the interim evaluation, without duplicating them, as relevant.

It is important that the data used includes the final values of the finalised projects, to avoid discrepancies between the consolidated financial figures and those measured by the indicators. In other words, the cut-off date for the information used should normally coincide with the end of the eligibility period. It may well be that in certain cases data availability will affect this possibility, but these cases should be justified. The evaluations should also take into account the data from any programme specific indicators defined by the Responsible Authorities.

### **2.3. Synergies with the Mid-Term Evaluation 2021-2027**

Policy evaluation is integral to the policy cycle.

It is typically carried out as a preparation to a new policy or implementation period (ex-ante evaluation or impact assessment), after the initial phase of implementation (interim or mid-term) and at the end of the implementation period (ex-post, retrospective or impact evaluation).

Even though its timing bears consequences as to the aim, scope and techniques to be used, a key common element for all kinds of evaluation is that they build upon cumulative knowledge. Every assessment enriches the evidence basis and creates relevant benchmarks and points of comparison, which, duly contextualised, can help gauge what works well or less well. For instance, a mid-term evaluation is concerned with whether the assumptions identified at the ex-ante stage still apply, and what is the early progress towards the objectives defined back then. Similarly, a mid-term evaluation compares the current implementation period, that is affected by any novelties introduced in the legal framework as well as the evolving contextual factors, with lessons learned from the past and the experiences summarised in the ex-post evaluation.

Hence the requirement that every new evaluation shall take into account the findings of the previous evaluations carried out. In particular, the 21-27 mid-term evaluation carried out by the Commission must take into account the findings of the 14-20 ex-post evaluation, according to the evaluation articles in the Fund-specific Regulations.<sup>2</sup> Whilst this requirement is not explicitly mentioned in the legal basis for the MS, their evaluation feed directly into the one carried out by the Commission. More generally, data and information coming from the ex-post is an essential background against which several aspects of the programmes' implementation should be examined, including their effectiveness (e.g. whether the support offered in 21-27 builds upon interventions that demonstrated their effectiveness in 14-20), efficiency (e.g. comparing the administrative costs or unit costs of sufficiently similar interventions with the previous programming period) but also complementarities etc.

---

<sup>2</sup> Article 34 of Regulation 1147/2021, Article 28 of Regulation 1148/2021, Article 29 of Regulation 1149/2021

For this reason, MS are strongly recommended to ensure adequate interaction between the 14-20 ex-post evaluation study and the 21-27 mid-term evaluation study.

As a minimum, data from 14-20 should be made available to the independent evaluators of the Mid-Term evaluation so that they can perform suitable comparative assessments.

### 3. MAIN DIFFERENCES AND POINTS OF ATTENTION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING

The indications provided in section 5 (carrying out the evaluation) and 6 (annexes on indicators definitions, methods on methodological examples etc.) of the guidance of May 2017 remain broadly valid, in the understanding that any reference to the interim evaluation should be taken to refer to the ex-post evaluation.

However, for the ex-post evaluation:

- as clarified in section 3.1;
  - o MS are allowed to upload their full evaluation reports in SFC2014, as per the template described in Box 1 below. Therefore, any reference to “the template in SFC” no longer applies;
- as clarified in section 3.2 and in Annex II
  - o data exchanges between the Commission and the MS continue to happen in SFC2014, but in a different format and module compared to the interim evaluation;
  - o specific arrangements should be considered when dealing with data that is not for public dissemination and the visibility requirements for the evaluations;
  - o certain definitions of the indicators of the common monitoring and evaluation framework have been updated in line with the most recent data collection arrangements – the consolidated metadata is presented in Annex II, which replaces section 6.1 and 6.2 of the May 2017 Guidance;
- as clarified in section 3.3:
  - o in an effort to provide evidence-based answers to the area of effectiveness, a qualitative analysis underpinned by a descriptive analysis of indicators data is normally not considered as sufficient;
  - o MS are strongly encouraged to include in their evaluation designs an evaluation matrix;
  - o certain aspects should be considered when relying on the FAQs contained in the Guidance

#### 3.1. Reporting on the evaluation and template

The independent evaluation experts shall produce an evaluation report in line with the RA’s requirements as stipulated in the ToR. The report shall follow the structure presented in this section. Contrary to the 2014-2020 interim evaluation, **the Responsible Authorities will not fill in a template of the evaluation report in SFC, but simply upload the full ex post evaluation report in SFC.**

The evaluation report is the key deliverable of the evaluation process. It should be built on critical judgements and should summarise the evaluation, presenting the replies to the evaluation questions, research undertaken, analysis, findings and conclusions/ lessons learned of the evaluation.

**The template for the *ex post* evaluation is presented in Box 1 below.**

*Box 1 – Template for the ex post evaluation report*

**Executive summary**

It should present the key achievements, findings and lessons learned that could be relevant from a policy perspective. If the report is drafted in the national language, it should be translated in English.

**Introduction**

This section should clarify the purpose of the evaluation, provide information on the independence of the evaluators<sup>3</sup> and an overview of the analytical approach (methods used to collect and assess qualitative and quantitative data). It should also point out the main limitations of the analysis and information on the robustness of the findings.

**Intervention logic**

This section should provide an overview of the relevant socio-economic context in which the AMIF and ISF intervention take place, identifying the key needs in the area and how the actions carried out in the national programmes were expected to contribute to addressing them.

**State of play of the implementation**

This section should provide a factual description of the progress made by the programmes, in terms of their financial as well as physical implementation. It should delineate the main challenges faced by the programme and any contextual changes that led to deviations from the initial plans.

**Evaluation findings, by question and sub-question**

Questions are organised by the evaluation criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, complementarity, EU added value, sustainability and simplification and reduction of administrative burden. The answers to the evaluation questions and sub-questions should be supported by a full triangulation of qualitative and quantitative evidence collected and assessed by the independent evaluators in connection to the judgement criteria agreed with the Responsible Authority. The national evaluation reports should cover only the actions implemented under the national programmes (shared management). Emergency Assistance projects and Union Actions will be addressed only under the coherence and complementarity area. All questions and sub-questions should be addressed.

**Conclusions and lessons learned**

This section is to wrap up on the key findings from the evaluation and to describe corresponding lessons learned to inform the policy cycle. Good (bad) practice cases should be included to the extent possible in connection to the lessons learned.

**Annexes**

The independent evaluators should include in the Annex the detailed methodological approach followed and the evaluation matrix. The annexes can be used to provide further detail into the qualitative and quantitative data used for the evaluations.

Since evaluation studies normally collect, review and assess an extensive amount of information, it is paramount that the independent evaluators make their best efforts to:

---

<sup>3</sup> The report should explain whether the evaluation was entrusted to external experts (contractors) or to an internal but functionally independent body. They should also explain how the independence requirement (as set in Art. 56(3) of the Horizontal Regulation) was ensured.

- draft a report that is clear, well structured and concise (the body of the report should not exceed 100 pages. More detailed information should be included in the Annexes, if relevant);
- cross-reference any policy suggestions/ recommendations with the related evaluation findings, to help the reader gauge the type, quality and coverage of the underlying evidence;
- draft a concise and decision-oriented executive summary, covering any lessons learned and their supporting evidence; and
- avoid the use of jargon and acronyms to the extent possible, particularly in the executive summary.

**The use of graphs, charts, diagrams and other visualisation tools that can help quickly grasp the main analytical insight from the evaluation is encouraged.**

### **3.2. Data for the ex-post evaluation of the period 2014-2020**

Evaluations are, to the extent possible, data-driven exercises. (Good quality) Data is essential to enrich the evidence basis for the assessment and develop sound answers to the evaluation questions.

The set of data and related sources that are relevant - and in some cases must be used - for the ex-post evaluations are defined by the legal basis, notably:

- a. the AMIF and ISF-BV and ISF-P regulations define, in Annex IV, common indicators to measure the achievement of the specific objectives of the fund/ instrument. These indicators are regularly used as part of the periodic reporting from all MS in the annual and final implementation reports;
- b. the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207, establishes a Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and identifies a list of result and impact indicators<sup>4</sup> that **must be used** in answering the evaluation questions;
- c. other indicators, such as programme specific indicators reported in the annual and final implementation reports, or additional sources identified by the independent evaluators as necessary to enrich the evidence basis for the evaluations/ assess the effects of the supported actions;
- d. financial data, such as allocation data from the national programmes, or expenditure data from annual implementation reports and accounts.

The common definitions and sources for a) and b) above were already described in the guidance on the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from May 2017. Over the summer of 2023, the Commission services have worked to bring these definitions in line with the standards currently used to collect and store the related data. Consolidated meta-data for the common output, result and impact indicators can therefore be found in Annex II, which replaces section 6.1 and 6.2 of the May 2017 guidance.

In general, one could distinguish between three main types of data providers:

- i. Responsible Authorities and beneficiaries, for the project data reported in the annual and final implementation report. This data is directly generated by the projects and actions supported by the national programmes (output and result indicators);
- ii. Member States, for data that can be directly but also indirectly related to the programme (result and impact indicators) and it is stored at national level;

---

<sup>4</sup> As per its Annex III and IV. Some of these indicators overlap with the common indicators for the annual and final implementation reports established by the fund-specific Regulations, but many of them go beyond those listed in such Regulations.

- iii. Third parties, typically aggregating and storing data collected at Member State level according to certain common standards. This data measures progress on relevant indicators (result or impact indicators) that is not directly generated by the national programmes, but to which they can contribute. Data stored and provided by third parties can be further distinguished between:
  - publicly available data (e.g. Eurostat) ;
  - data that is not for public dissemination (restricted access, e.g. certain sensitive data from Europol or the EUAA).

Given these differences in the source and nature of the data, different “document types” have been defined in SFC2014. These allow exchanging data so that both the Responsible Authorities and Commission can use access it on time to carry out their *ex post* evaluations.

As clarified in section 4 below:

- data stored at the MS level (therefore linked to i) and ii)) will have to be transmitted by the Responsible Authorities to the Commission via SFC2014. To this end, templates to be filled by the RAs have been created and are attached to the transmission of this note. They will remain available in the DG HOME-specific section of the SFC2014 portal under the “[committee workshop](#)” heading.
- data stored by third parties (linked to iii)) is shared by the COM with the RAs. This data is accessible in SFC2014, under “Evaluation / Evaluation documents” and uploaded by the Commission as document type “*Data from third parties for the ex-post evaluation*”. Two files are included: one with publicly available data containing values for all MS, and a second file with restricted access data (only for the MS concerned).

In line with the work done for the interim evaluation and May 2017 guidance (section 3 and 5.1.3), the reference year for the data is the financial year, not the calendar year. The data transmitted by COM is already transformed into the financial year.

Box 2 – how to deal with data that is not for public dissemination

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the the topics and target groups of the actions supported by the Home Affairs Funds, a subset of the common indicators listed in the Common Monitoring and Evaluation framework is identified as “for internal use”. Therefore, it is not to be publicly disseminated.

At the same time, all *ex post* evaluations need to be published in line with Article 56(4) of the Horizontal regulation. The Member States and the Commission must also comply with Article 2(2) of the Commission Delegated Regulation 2017/207, thus using the data from the indicators listed in Annex III and IV in their evaluation reports. To make sure that these requirements are jointly respected:

- the COM shares restricted-access data via SFC2014 to each Responsible Authority individually, so that it is accessible only to the relevant MS;
- the Responsible Authorities share all data with the independent evaluators, specifying that the restricted-access data should be handled in line with data protection requirements and only for the purpose of the evaluation;
- the independent evaluators draft the evaluation report based on all the data available. This is the official evaluation report to be submitted to the Commission. However, this report should not be published in its entirety.
- A redacted version of the *ex post* evaluation report, containing evidence-based replies to the evaluation questions but not any underlying “restricted-access” data, should be published in line with Article 56(4) HR.

### **3.3. Methods and Techniques – some additional recommendations for the *ex post* evaluation**

The two sections below complement the methodological approach suggested in sections 5 and 6 of the guidance for the interim evaluation.

#### *3.3.1. Evaluation Matrix and Indicative Judgement Criteria*

The core component of any methodological approach to an evaluation is the evaluation matrix. An evaluation matrix clarifies the link between the questions, the judgement criteria, the supporting indicators or descriptors to be used, the sources to be used and the related methodological approach.

Judgement criteria clarify the logical underlying framework for the evaluation questions, outlining the assumptions to be demonstrated in order for the assessment to be positive, or statements to be confirmed by the analysis. Importantly, whilst the indicative judgement criteria should help define the scope of the evaluation and the main analytical goals, they do not cover the full extent of the evaluation design. The descriptive component (focusing on HOW rather than IF or TO WHAT EXTENT certain things have occurred) should be fully considered. For example, in describing the extent to which a certain measure is effective or efficient, the evaluation should always pay attention to the features that made it possible (or not). Judgement criteria are not compulsory, but highly recommended tools. The Managing Authority may develop additional judgement criteria, adapted to the specific features of the programmes, but it is recommended to keep the total number limited and proportional.

A theoretical example of an evaluation matrix is outlined below, based on one of the evaluation questions presented above.

Table 1 – theoretical example of an evaluation matrix

Eval. Criteria	(Sub) Eval. question	Judgement Criteria	Descriptor or Indicator	Methodological Approach	Sources
Effectiveness	What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the asylum procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Output and result indicators have achieved their targets, provided these were correctly defined and in line with evolving needs</li> <li>- Normative judgements from the stakeholders, confirm that the fund contributed to the objectives identified in the sub questions</li> <li>- The fund supported types of interventions that are known to be effective as per the available evidence (including, e.g., relevant academic literature, the interim evaluation of the fund, etc.)</li> <li>- The fund embedded available good practices in its implementation where relevant and possible</li> <li>- There is appropriate evidence of a positive contribution of the fund to the trend of any impact indicators, once controlled for confounding factors</li> <li>- There is no evidence of unintended effects and/ or negative spill overs</li> </ul> <p>...</p>	<p>Relevant indicators (e.g. SO1 R1, SO1 R3, SO1 I1, SO1 I2)</p> <p>Impact coefficients from academic or grey literature on the effects on the participants</p> <p>Good practices identified relevant studies</p> <p>Normative judgements from actors involved in the asylum procedures</p> <p>....</p>	<p>Mixed methods, quantitative analysis (econometric or counterfactual) triangulated with and normative judgements from stakeholders/ expert panels etc.</p> <p>A survey/ ad-hoc interviews/ a focus group will be carried out to gather the feedback from the relevant actors.</p> <p>....</p>	<p><u>Primary sources</u></p> <p>Interviews with the MA</p> <p>Focus groups/ panels with experts</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>Secondary sources</u></p> <p>Academic and grey literature</p> <p>National programmes</p> <p>Annual implementation Reports</p> <p>Data on the indicators of the CMEF</p> <p>....</p>

A preliminary or partial evaluation matrix may be included by the Responsible Authorities in the Terms of Reference for this assignment, in order to define, in more concrete terms, the expectations for the evaluation. It remains, of course, for the independent evaluators to complete/ complement and finalise the evaluation matrix. In any event, this tool will allow the Responsible Authority to gauge any methodological choices made by the evaluators and thereby the quality of the evidence-base for the conclusions and lessons learned.

### 3.3.2. *Focus on the assessment of the effects*

The Guidance document for the interim evaluation already provides ample and suitable information on the links between the indicators and the evaluation questions, as well as methods to assess them.

However, in the context of the interim evaluations, due to the early stage of the implementation and time it takes for any effects to materialise, quantitative information and dedicated techniques to understand ‘*what would have happened had the intervention not taken place*’ were hardly used.

For the interim evaluation, the guidance indicated that three main methods should be considered:

- descriptive quantitative analysis<sup>5</sup> (assessment of face values and dynamics of the common indicators);
- qualitative analysis<sup>6</sup> (expert panels, interviews, surveys, theory of change etc.);
- counterfactual impact evaluation using data on final recipients and non-recipients (counterfactual at the participant level).<sup>7</sup>

In addition, the guidance specified that, as a minimum, the first and second method should be used. This made the (attempt to) use quantitative techniques to review the programmes fully discretionary.

Whilst this provision was consistent with the goal of an interim evaluation, the ex-post evaluation must, according to the legal basis, examine the effects of the programmes. Therefore, it will have to focus - to the extent possible based on data availability and methodological constraints - on the causal links between the (negative or positive) progress towards the objectives of the legal basis and the intervention supported by the fund. In other words, the ex-post evaluation should try to examine the changes that are caused by the national programmes, net of any external (confounding) factors.

So, as a general principle, it may not suffice to simply provide a description of the trends of the indicators and expert opinions. The aim of the evaluations should be to the extent possible to understand:

- if the intervention made a difference to those receiving the support (micro level, short to medium term, partial equilibrium);
- if the intervention made a difference at societal level (macro-level, medium to long term, general equilibrium).

As recalled during the [Webinar](#) and in the presentation accompanying this note, the starting point is, in any event, the development of a strong and evidence-based theory of change,<sup>8</sup> whose hypothesis and

---

<sup>5</sup> cfr. Section 5.1.1 of the may 2017 guidance, Approach I

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, Approach II

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, Approach III

<sup>8</sup> In more detail, the starting point is the intervention logic “*which describes how and why a desired change is expected to happen, i.e. a theory of change. This theory needs to be tested and evaluated to see if it fits the data available and that assumed causal links are correct. This will involve both looking for evidence which could prove or disprove the causes that have been hypothesised and exploring evidence which might point to other*

causal links should be assessed via qualitative and, whenever feasible, quantitative analysis. In line with the Better Regulation toolbox “*Quantitative analysis complements qualitative analysis: both are essential to build the narrative of the evaluation and to explain the analysis of impacts.*”<sup>9</sup>

The guidance for the interim evaluation already describes most of the methods that are geared towards this goal and provides a few examples that could serve as inspiration for the independent evaluators. Over the years, the evaluation practice continued to evolve, and the new [Better Regulation Toolbox #68](#) (methods for evaluating causal effects) offers some updated guidance on the matter of the quantification of causal effects.<sup>10</sup>

Responsible Authorities are therefore recommended to include in their terms of reference a request for the independent evaluators to include in their evaluation proposals methodologies for the quantification of the effects which are in line with the better regulation toolbox #68.

It is also acknowledged that, as indicated in the Better Regulation Toolbox “... *some marginalised social groups, such as the homeless or irregular migrants cannot be found in registry data, do not appear in official statistics; they can probably be only reached via in-depth field interviews*”.<sup>11</sup> Thus, it may be that data availability or methodological constraints will prevent the independent evaluators from quantifying the effects, or that they will only be able to quantify a part of them.

Whenever quantitative methods for the estimation of the causal impact cannot be applied, the related limitations should be clearly described in the reports and accompanied by mitigation measures.

Finally, in assessing the data coming from the monitoring system, the independent evaluators should take into account the information contained in Box 2.

---

*possible causes that lie outside the theory of change from which the assessment departs.*” Better Regulation Toolbox (2023), p. 288

<sup>9</sup> [Better Regulation Toolbox \(2023\), #68 p. 584](#)

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g.: (i) the “staggered difference-in-difference approach”, exploiting the situation where even though all eligible participants have been supported, they did not receive support at the same point in time, which may create the opportunity to identify a proper control group; (ii) the “difference-in-difference” method by intensity of support, were, again, the control group can be identified within those participating to the support but at a different intensity.

<sup>11</sup> [Better Regulation Toolbox \(2023\), #68 p. 598](#)

*Box 2 – assessment of quantitative data from the monitoring system*

When assessing quantitative data and information on the progress of the programme measured by the standard monitoring system, it is critical that such a review be fully informed by knowledge on the functioning of the monitoring systems, its rules, practices and, particularly, any related limitations. Amongst others, it is worth recalling:

- the importance of contextualising the information on performance based on qualitative information on the programme implementation;
- the need to specify how the issue of double counting (i.e. a participants receiving support multiple times within the programme) was tackled;
- need to spell out whether minimum thresholds for the intensity of support were used or not – to avoid that e.g. web-users are counted in;
- the need to critically assess the quality of the information generated by the monitoring system, including e.g. any issues with the tagging system for the types of actions in the accounts;
- need to review critically the information on progress towards the targets to make sure that the picture coming from the data reflects reality and can inform policy making<sup>12</sup>.

The annual and final implementation reports can be used to contextualise the analysis of quantitative data. Triangulation with qualitative information, especially from actors directly involved in the implementation of the operations traced by the monitoring system, should always be ensured.

*3.3.3. Points of attention on the FAQs*

The frequently asked questions included in SFC2014 as well as in the interim guidance continue to apply. In referring to them, there are two main aspects to be considered:

- that the end of the eligibility period was extended by one year;
- that potentially the approach used by the monitoring system to deal with multiple participations of the same individual in the projects and related possibility of double counting should be spelled out in the evaluation (see also box 2).

**4. PROCEDURAL ASPECTS AND NEXT STEPS**

The Responsible Authorities are invited to:

- take note of any revisions included in this document as a result of the discussions and feedback gathered after the Webinar on the ex-post evaluation held on 20 July 2023, as well as COM work on data for the ex-post evaluation stored by third parties (see section 3.2);
- if not already done, assess their internal needs also in terms of administrative capacity and expertise to manage the evaluation studies as well as the possible need to rely on technical assistance for training or methodological support. Follow up actions should also be carried out;
- look for synergies with the 21-27 mid-term evaluation, whatever the arrangements with the independent evaluators for the studies;<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The achievement ratio (or target achievement) of milestone and targets can be a key indicator of the progress of the operations towards the objectives of the programmes. However, the information is only helpful if the assumptions and methodology used to calculate the milestone or target values are of good quality. Therefore, any analysis of target achievement should be backed by consideration to the quality of the target values.

- refer to their Geographical Desk Officers across all phases of the preparation and implementation of their evaluations in case of doubts or need for clarification. In case of questions of methodological nature or linked to the data received, they can also address their questions to the Functional Mailbox [HOME-FUNDS-EVALUATIONS@ec.europa.eu](mailto:HOME-FUNDS-EVALUATIONS@ec.europa.eu) ;
- access the data made available in SFC2014<sup>14</sup> and share it with the independent evaluators once selected. Contact the functional mailbox with the relevant Geographical Desk Officer in copy in case of issues with the data received;<sup>15</sup>
- consolidate the data stored at MS level so that the independent evaluators can use it to carry out the *ex post* evaluation at the MS level. As soon as the data is consolidated and possibly by September 2024, upload this data in SFC2014 following the templates shared together with this note, as described in section 3.2 by using the document type “*Data for the ex-post evaluation - HR Article 55(5)*”;
- submit the final report of the *ex post* evaluation, by uploading a word and pdf document in SFC2014, under “Evaluation / Evaluation documents” using “*Ex post evaluation report – HR Article 57(1) point (b)*” as document type by 31 December 2024.

## 5. REASONS FOR RETURNING AN *EX POST* EVALUATION REPORT

As clarified in the introduction and overview of the legal basis, there are certain formal requirements that are laid down by the Horizontal Regulation and the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, which apply to the *ex post* evaluations submitted by the Member States by 31 December 2024.

Although the Commission does not have a mandate to formally review or assess the quality of the methodologies and the related findings, it must carry out its supervisory role and ensure that the legal requirements are respected.

Therefore, once submitted, the evaluation reports will be checked to make sure that they:

- a. provide a reply to each of the questions defined in Annex I (AMIF) and II (ISF) of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207, following the template described in section 3.1- Box 1 of this document, which was developed in accordance with Article 2(1) of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207,
- b. make use of the indicators listed in Annex III and IV the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207 and as far as possible of the indicators included in the Annual and Final Implementation Reports – Article 2(2)

---

<sup>13</sup> In general, it is advised to reflect on the possibility and feasibility of assigning the 21-27 mid-term evaluation and 14-20 ex-post evaluation to the same service providers/ independent evaluators. This would ensure a seamless exchange of findings. Even in case the independent evaluators differed between the two evaluation studies, Responsible and Managing Authorities would need to ensure that the relevant comparative data and information is shared and can feed into both evaluations.

<sup>14</sup> Uploaded by the COM and accessible under “Evaluation/ Evaluation documents”, as document type “Data from third parties for the ex-post evaluation”. Cfr. section 3.2 for more details.

<sup>15</sup> The Commission decided to play an active role in the collection of data that is stored by third parties (e.g. Eurostat, EUAA, Europol etc.) to ensure comparability of the figures across the MS and to reduce the volume of data to be gathered by the Responsible Authorities. This work included the transformation of data from the calendar year into the financial year, in line with the methodology described in the guidance from May 2017. Albeit stored by third parties, this data is typically generated at the MS level and may or may not be already at disposal of the Responsible Authority. The responsible authorities could also have access to more recent data, which they are free to use. In case of issues, RAs should contact the functional mailbox.

With regards to b), it is acknowledged that data availability may be limited in some cases, especially in relation to sub-indicators or detailed breakdowns. It is also possible that some of the data will not lend itself well to underpinning evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions, due to the impact of confounding factors.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, the independent evaluators, whilst leveraging upon the methodological advice provided in this guidance, may use the data in different ways. Whatever the specific methodological choices and/ or limitations, evaluations which do not make use of the mandatory data and do not provide a justification for that, may be returned to the Responsible Authorities.

---

<sup>16</sup> In such cases, data should be used to analyse the dynamic of the context in which the national programmes unfold.

**ANNEX I – EVALUATION QUESTIONS, SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATIVE JUDGEMENT CRITERIA****AMIF**

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
<b>Effectiveness<sup>(17)</sup></b>	How did the Fund contribute to strengthening and developing all aspects of the CEAS, including its external dimension?	What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the asylum procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Output and result indicators have achieved their targets, provided these were correctly defined and in line with evolving needs</li> <li>- Normative judgements from the stakeholders, including where relevant counterfactual self-estimation and retrospective pre-test, confirm that the fund contributed to the objectives identified in the sub questions</li> <li>- Challenges that affect implementation and the progress towards the objectives of the fund were duly identified and linked with effective remedy strategies</li> <li>- The fund supported types of interventions that are known to be effective as per the available evidence (including, e.g., relevant academic literature, the interim evaluation of the fund, etc.)</li> <li>- The fund embedded available good practices in its implementation where relevant and possible</li> <li>- There is appropriate evidence of a positive contribution of the fund to the trend of any impact indicators, once controlled for confounding factors</li> <li>- There is no evidence of unintended effects and/ or negative spill overs</li> <li>- All actions supported under the Fund were implemented in full compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU</li> <li>- There is evidence of improved cooperation with third countries where relevant to the objectives of the fund</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
		What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the reception conditions, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards the achievement of a successful implementation of the legal framework of the qualification directive (and its subsequent modifications), and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards enhancing Member State capacity to develop, monitor and evaluate their asylum policies and procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards the establishment, development and implementation of national resettlement programmes and strategies, and other humanitarian admission programmes, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
	How did the Fund contribute to supporting legal migration to the MS in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs,	What progress was made towards supporting legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals, and how did the	

<sup>(17)</sup> This question is accompanied by several layers of sub-questions. The first one “To what extent has the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (‘Fund’) reached the objectives defined in Regulation (EU) No 516/2014?” is omitted as it is further operationalised by the sub-questions illustrated in the table.

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
	while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of MS, and to promoting the effective integration of TCNs?	Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	-
		What progress was made towards supporting cooperation among the Member States, with a view to safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards building capacity on integration and legal migration within the Member States, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
	How did the Fund contribute to enhancing fair and effective return strategies in the MS which contribute to combating illegal immigration, with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit?	What progress was made towards supporting the measures accompanying return procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards effective implementation of return measures (voluntary and forced), and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards enhancing practical cooperation between Member States and/or with authorities of third countries on return measures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards building capacity on return, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
	How did the Fund contribute to enhancing solidarity and responsibility-sharing between the Member States, in particular towards those most affected by migration and asylum flows, including through practical cooperation?	How did the Fund contribute to the transfer of asylum applicants (relocation as per Council Decisions (EU) 2015/1523 (1) and (EU) 2015/1601 (2))?	
		How did the Fund contribute to the transfer between Member States of beneficiaries of international protection?	

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
	How did the Fund contribute to supporting the Member States in duly substantiated emergency situations requiring urgent action?	What type of emergency actions was implemented?	
		How did the emergency actions implemented under the Fund contribute to addressing the urgent needs of the Member State?	
		What were the main results of the emergency actions?	
<b>Efficiency</b>	Were the general objectives of the Fund achieved at reasonable cost?)	To what extent were the results of the Fund achieved at reasonable cost in terms of deployed financial and human resources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The fund supported types of interventions that are known to be cost-effective, based on available evidence, including relevant literature or the ex-post evaluation of the previous programme</li> <li>- Appropriate arrangements were used to select cost-effective operations</li> <li>- The evidence coming from the operations indicates that the cost per unit is in line or below existing benchmarks and estimates</li> <li>- The differences in the cost per unit among similar operations within the fund can be explained and justified (e.g. by differences in the intensity or quality of the support offered, innovativeness, purchase power, emergency context etc.)</li> <li>- The management and control system of the MS, described as per the legal basis, ensures quality of the of the implementation of national programmes and the prevention, detection and correction of irregularities, including fraud, and the recovery of amounts unduly paid, together with any interest on late payments</li> <li>- The administrative burden is proportionate for all implementing actors (Responsible Authorities and other delegated authorities), compared to the previous programming period similar services offered to comparable target groups without the support of the programme</li> <li>- The administrative burden is proportionate for all beneficiaries, compared to the previous programming period/ similar services offered to comparable target groups without the support of the programme</li> <li>- The administrative burden is proportionate for all end-</li> </ul>
		What measures were put in place to prevent, detect, report and follow up on cases of fraud and other irregularities, and how did they perform?	

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
			<p>users, e.g. compared to the previous programming period/ similar services offered to comparable target groups without the support of the programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Absence of ‘gold-plating’ at the national level (e.g. from Responsible Authorities, Delegated Authorities, national Audit Authorities), i.e. requirements are not interpreted more restrictively than the legal basis or relevant documents providing methodological advice to the Member States and unless a justified reason exists</li> <li>- Absence of ‘gold-plating’ at the EU level, i.e. requirements are not interpreted more restrictively than in the legal basis and unless a justified reason exists</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance</b>	Did the objectives of the interventions funded by the Fund correspond to the actual needs?	Did the objectives set by the Member State in the National Programme respond to the identified needs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A needs assessment is performed and updated on a regular basis or whenever there are relevant contextual changes</li> <li>- The partnership / monitoring committee is able to provide timely input on evolving needs and relevant developments on the ground</li> </ul>
		Did the objectives set in the Annual Work Programme (Union actions) address the actual needs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an adequate degree of flexibility in the design of the projects, call for proposals, procurement</li> <li>- Where necessary, non-substantial changes to the programme strategy and work programmes can be applied swiftly</li> </ul>
		Did the objectives set in the Annual Work Programme (Emergency Assistance) address the actual needs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are rules and procedures in place that ensure that the substantial adjustments of the programme can be implemented in due time if new needs arise</li> </ul>
		Which measures did the Member State put in place to address changing needs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If there have been changes in the needs after the programme adoption, the programme strategy or operations have been adapted in due time or, alternatively, the new needs have been duly addressed via the thematic facility</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
<b>Coherence</b>	Were the objectives set in the national programme Fund coherent with the ones set in other programmes funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work?	Was an assessment of other interventions with similar objectives carried out and taken into account during the programming stage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Structures, organisational arrangements or coordination mechanisms are in place which ensure coordination, complementarities and, where relevant, synergies across the different management modes of the same programme</li> <li>- Coordination mechanisms and arrangements are used regularly and to good effect</li> <li>- Alleged overlaps are in fact justified on objective grounds (e.g. same target group but different type of measure/ different need addressed/ different readiness of the type of funding support chosen)</li> <li>- The programme is coherent with the current policy agendas at EU and national level</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
	Was the coherence ensured also during the implementation of the Fund?	Were coordination mechanisms between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives established for the implementing period?	
		Were the actions implemented through the Fund coherent with and non-contradictory to other interventions with similar objectives?	
<b>Complementarity</b>	Were the objectives set in the national programme and the corresponding implemented actions complementary to those set in the framework of other policies, in particular those pursued by the Member State	Was an assessment of other interventions with complementary objectives carried out and taken into account during the programming stage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Structures, organisational arrangements or coordination mechanisms are in place which ensure coordination, complementarities and, where relevant, synergies across other EU funds, in particular cohesion policy and EU's external action</li> <li>- Coordination mechanisms and arrangements are used regularly and to good effect</li> <li>- Alleged overlaps are in fact justified on objective grounds (e.g. same target group but different type of measure/ different need addressed/ different readiness of the type of funding support chosen)</li> <li>- The programme offers support to cross cutting policy agendas by complementing the support offered by other EU funds</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
		Were coordination mechanisms between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives established to ensure their complementarity for the implementing period?	
		Were mechanisms aimed to prevent overlapping of financial instruments put in place?	
<b>EU Added Value</b>	Was any value added brought about by the EU support	What are the main types of added value resulting from the Fund support (volume, scope, role, process)?	<p>The programme focuses on areas, interventions and target groups where the results at the EU level can go beyond what can be achieved by the Member States acting on their own. Amongst others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is evidence of scope effects, i.e. of additional</li> </ul>
		Would the Member State have carried out the actions required to implement the EU policies in the Fund areas without the financial support of the Fund?	

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
		What would be the most likely consequences of an interruption of the support provided by the Fund?	target groups addressed or additional types of intervention offered
		To which extent have actions supported by the Fund resulted in a benefit at the Union level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is evidence of scale effects, i.e. of a higher volume of services offered/end-users addressed</li> <li>- There is evidence of function/role/process effects, i.e. of learning and increased capacity to manage the provision of public support within the administrations involved</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
Sustainability	Are the positive effects of the projects supported by the Fund likely to last when the support from AMIF will be over?	What were the main measures adopted by the Member State to ensure the sustainability of the results of the projects implemented with the Fund support (both at programming and implementation stage)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequate arrangements existed and were used to check the sustainability of the project proposals</li> <li>- There is no evidence of dependency, i.e. of systematic lack of investment based on national resources for relevant services that are provided entirely through support from EU funds.</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
		Were mechanisms put in place to ensure a sustainability check at programming and implementation stage?	
		To what extent are the outcomes/benefits of the actions sustained by the Fund expected to continue thereafter?	
Simplification and reduction of administrative burden	Were the Fund management procedures simplified and the administrative burden reduced for its beneficiaries?)	Did the innovative procedures introduced by the Fund (simplified cost option, multiannual programming, national eligibility rules, more comprehensive national programmes allowing for flexibility) bring about simplification for the beneficiaries of the Fund?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Simplified cost options were used were relevant and created simplification for the different stakeholders concerned</li> <li>- The national programmes allowed steering resources towards new and emerging needs at a low administrative cost</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>

**ISF-BV**

**Table 2 – Sub questions and indicative judgement criteria - effectiveness only – ISF BV – please refer to Annex II of the COM delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207 for the full list of sub-questions for all the evaluation criteria**

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
<b>Effectiveness <sup>(18)</sup></b>	How did the Fund contribute to the achievement of the following specific objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support a common visa policy to facilitate legitimate travel;</li> <li>• Provide a high quality of service to visa applicants;</li> <li>• Ensure equal treatment of third-country nationals and</li> <li>• Tackle illegal migration?</li> </ul>	What progress was made towards promoting the development and implementation of the common visa policy to facilitate legitimate travel, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output and result indicators have achieved their targets, provided these were correctly defined and in line with evolving needs</li> <li>• Normative judgements from the stakeholders confirm that the fund contributed to the objectives identified in the sub questions</li> <li>• Challenges that affect implementation and the progress towards the objectives of the fund were duly identified and linked with effective remedy strategies</li> <li>• The fund supported types of interventions that are known to be effective as per the available evidence (including, e.g., relevant academic literature, the interim evaluation of the fund, etc.)</li> <li>• The fund embedded available good practices in its implementation where relevant and possible</li> <li>• There is appropriate evidence of a positive contribution of the fund to the trend of any impact indicators, once controlled for confounding factors</li> <li>• There is no evidence of unintended effects and/ or negative spillovers</li> <li>• All actions supported under the Fund were implemented in full compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU</li> <li>• There is evidence of improved cooperation with third countries where relevant to the objectives of the fund</li> <li>• ...</li> </ul>
		What progress was made towards ensuring better consular coverage and harmonised practices on visa issuance between MS, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards ensuring the application of the Union's <i>acquis</i> on visas and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards MS' contribution to strengthening the cooperation between MS operating in third countries as regards the flows of third-country national into the territory of MS, including prevention and tackling of illegal immigration, as well as the cooperation with third countries, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards supporting the common visa policy by setting up and running IT systems, their communication infrastructure and equipment, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		How did the operating support provided for in Article 10 of the Regulation (EU) No 515/2014 contribute to the achievement of the specific objective on common visa policy?	
	How did the Fund contribute to the following specific	What progress was made towards promoting the development, implementation and enforcement of	

<sup>(18)</sup> This question is accompanied by several layers of sub-questions. The first one “How did the Internal Security Fund (‘Fund’) contribute to the achievement of the general objective defined in the Regulation (EU) No 515/2014?” is omitted as it is further operationalised by the sub-questions illustrated in the table.

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
	<p>objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supporting integrated border management, including promoting further harmonisation of border management-related measures in accordance with common Union standards and through the sharing of information between MS and between MS and the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the MS of the EU?</li> <li>Ensuring, on one hand, a uniform and high level of control and protection of the external borders, including by the tackling of illegal immigration and, on the other hand, the smooth crossing of the external borders in conformity with the Schengen <i>acquis</i>, while guaranteeing access to international protection for those needing it, in accordance with the obligations contracted by the MS in the field of human rights, including the principle of non-refoulement?</li> </ul>	policies with a view to ensure the absence of any controls on persons when crossing the internal borders, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards carrying out checks on persons and monitoring efficiently the crossing of external borders, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards establishing gradually an integrated management system for external borders, based on solidarity and responsibility, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards ensuring the application of the Union's <i>acquis</i> on border management, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards contributing to reinforcing situational awareness at the external borders and the reaction capabilities of MS, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards setting up and running IT systems, their communication infrastructure and equipment that support border checks and border surveillance at the external borders, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?	
		What progress was made towards supporting services to MS in duly substantiated emergency situations requiring urgent action at the external borders, and how did the Emergency Assistance contribute to achieving this progress? What type of emergency actions was implemented? How did the emergency actions implemented under the Fund contribute to addressing the urgent needs of the Member State? What were the main results of the emergency actions?	
		How did the operating support provided for in Article 10 of the Regulation (EU) No 515/2014	

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)	Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
	contribute to the achievement of the specific objective on border management?	

**ISF-P**

*Table 3 – Sub questions and indicative judgement criteria - effectiveness only – ISF-P – please refer to Annex II of the COM delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207 for the full list of sub-questions for all the evaluation criteria*

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)	Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
<b>Effectiveness <sup>(19)</sup></b>	How did the Fund contribute to the achievement of the following specific objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of cross-border, serious and organised crime, including terrorism?;</li> <li>• Reinforcement of the coordination and cooperation between law enforcement authorities and other national authorities of Member States, including with Europol or other relevant Union bodies, and with relevant third countries and international organisations?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output and result indicators have achieved their targets, provided these were correctly defined and in line with evolving needs</li> <li>• Normative judgements from the stakeholders confirm that the fund contributed to the objectives identified in the subquestions</li> <li>• Challenges that affect implementation and the progress towards the objectives of the fund were duly identified and linked with effective remedy strategies</li> <li>• The fund supported types of interventions that are known to be effective as per the available evidence (including, e.g., relevant academic literature, the interim evaluation of the fund, etc.)</li> <li>• The fund embedded available good practices in its implementation where relevant and possible</li> <li>• There is appropriate evidence of a positive contribution of the fund to the trend of any impact indicators, once controlled for confounding factors</li> <li>• There is no evidence of unintended effects and/ or negative spillovers</li> <li>• All actions supported under the Fund were implemented in full compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU</li> <li>• There is evidence of improved cooperation with third</li> </ul>
	What progress was made towards the achievement of the expected results of strengthening Member States' capacity to combat cross-border, serious and organised crime, including terrorism and to reinforce their mutual cooperation in this field, and how did the Fund contribute to the achievement of this progress?	
	What progress was made towards developing administrative and operational coordination and cooperation among Member States' public authorities, Europol or other relevant Union bodies and, where appropriate, with third countries and international organisations, and how did the Fund contribute to the achievement of this progress?	
	What progress was made towards developing training schemes, such as those regarding technical and professional skills and knowledge of obligations on human rights and fundamental freedoms, in implementation of EU training policies, including through specific Union law enforcement exchange programmes, and how did the Fund contribute to the achievement of this progress?	
	What progress was made towards putting in place measures, safeguard mechanisms and best practices for the identification and support of witnesses and	

<sup>(19)</sup> This question is accompanied by several layers of sub-questions. The first one “How did the Internal Security Fund (‘Fund’) contribute to the achievement of the general objective defined in the Regulation (EU) No 513/2014?” is omitted as it is further operationalised by the sub-questions illustrated in the table.

EV. Criterion	Sub-question(s)		Preliminary /indicative judgement Criteria
		victims of crime, including victims of terrorism, and how did the Fund contribute to the achievement of this progress?	<p>countries where relevant to the objectives of the fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...</li> </ul>
	How did the Fund contribute to improve the capacity of Member States to manage effectively security-related risks and crises, and protecting people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security-related incidents?	What progress was made towards reinforcing Member States' administrative and operational capability to protect critical infrastructure in all sectors of economic activity, including through public-private partnerships and improved coordination, cooperation, exchange and dissemination of know-how and experience within the Union and with relevant third Countries, and how did the Fund contribute to the achievement of this progress?	
		What progress was made towards establishing secure links and effective coordination between existing sector-specific early warning and crisis cooperation actors at Union and national level, and how did the Fund contribute to the achievement of this progress?	
		What progress was made towards improving the administrative and operational capacity of the Member States and the Union to develop comprehensive threat and risk assessments, and how did the Fund contribute to the achievement of this progress?	

**ANNEX II – INDICATORS’ DEFINITIONS, SOURCES, BASELINES (META-DATA)****Indicators by specific objective – AMIF**

This section presents the common indicators contained in the Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 and the result and impact indicators contained in Annex III of the Delegated Regulation on CMEF.

The RAs report annually on the common indicators in the Annual Implementation Report (AIR) in SFC.

For the indicators listed below, further information is provided to help the RAs collect the data and prepare the interim evaluation report: i) Data source; ii) Measurement unit; iii) Reference period; iv) Definition, and v) Useful information where necessary.

The measurement unit and the reference period are reported for each indicator.

The indicators are organised by specific objective, following Article 3 of the Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 and Annex III of the Delegated Regulation on CMEF.

*SO1: Asylum and reception*

<b>Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension</b>				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>OUTPUT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO1 C4. Number of country-of-origin information products and fact-finding missions conducted with the assistance of the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of products and missions	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013
<b>SO1 C5. Number of projects supported under the Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate asylum policies in Member States</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of projects	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013
<b>SO1 C6. Number of persons resettled with support of the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of persons	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO1 R1. Number of target group persons provided with assistance through projects in the field of reception and asylum systems supported under the Fund:</b> <b>i) number of target group persons benefiting from information and assistance throughout the asylum procedures</b> <b>ii) number of target group persons benefiting from legal assistance and representation</b> <b>iii) number of vulnerable persons and unaccompanied minors benefiting from specific assistance</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014).</p> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) The subcategory 1.3 should include the number of vulnerable persons and unaccompanied minors that received specific assistance, not any type of assistance. Based on Recital 33 of Regulation 516/ 2014, "specific assistance" should be understood as a special attention paid to, or a dedicated response provided for the specific situation of vulnerable persons, in particular women, unaccompanied minors and other minors at risk. The definition of vulnerable asylum applicants as per the Reception Conditions Directive 2013/33 (Art.2 (k) and Art.21 ) should be taken into account on this issue.</p> <p>Some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•A person with a disability receiving 'general' legal advice will be counted under subcategory No 1.2. The assistance of subcategory 1.1 should refer to any assistance excluding specific assistance covered in subcategory indicators 1.2 and 1.3.</li> <li>•A pregnant woman received psychological consultations throughout the asylum procedures.</li> </ul> <p>If the vulnerable person benefits from psychological assistance which is not specifically targeted to vulnerable persons, she will be counted under subcategory No1.1. On the contrary, if the psychological assistance is only offered to vulnerable person, then she will be counted under subcategory No 1.3.^</p> <p>b) A person should be counted only once under the common indicator. However, it can be counted in several sub-categories.</p> <p>Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Persons who received legal counselling should be included in the relevant</li> </ul>	Number of persons	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>subcategory referring to legal assistance and representation. However, if the same persons has received both legal assistance and representation and information and assistance, it should be counted under both subcategories. Obviously, in the common indicator a(i) this person should be counted only once.</p> <p>c) The Regulation does not specify that legal assistance has to be provided only by fully qualified lawyers. For further information you may refer to Article 21 ('Conditions for the provision of legal and procedural information free of charge and free legal assistance and representation') of Directive 2013/32.</p>				

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 R2. Capacity (i.e. number of places) of new reception accommodation infrastructure set up in line with the common requirements for reception conditions as set out in the Union acquis and of existing reception accommodation infrastructure improved in accordance with the same requirements as a result of the projects supported under the Fund and percentage in the total reception accommodation capacity</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014).</p> <p>This indicator is broken down in sub-categories such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) new reception accommodation infrastructure, set up in line with the common requirements for reception conditions as set out in the Union acquis, and of existing reception accommodation infrastructure improved in accordance with the same requirements as a result of the projects supported under the Fund</li> <li>b) the same number as a percentage of the total accommodation capacity</li> </ul> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) The response to this indicator shall report on the number of places created or improved under projects supported by AMIF. If a Member State does not fund projects aiming at creating new places or improving accommodation capacity, the result reported will read "zero" new/improved places. Therefore the percentage in the total reception accommodation capacity will also be "zero percent".</p> <p>b) The total reception accommodation capacity refers to the accommodation of asylum seekers, including unaccompanied minors.</p>	Number of places and percentage	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 R3. Number of persons trained in asylum-related topics with the assistance of the Fund, and that number as a percentage of the total number of staff trained in those topics</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014).</p> <p>This indicator is broken down in sub-categories such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) with the assistance of the Fund</li> <li>b) as a percentage of the total number of staff trained in those topics.</li> </ul> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) Percentage= number of persons trained in asylum related topics with the assistance of AMIF / Total number of persons trained in asylum related topics (under AMIF and with other sources) *100.</p> <p>You will need to obtain data on total number of staff trained in asylum related topics from all asylum-related institutions, not only staff from institutions which will participate in AMIF projects. If the cost of providing the exact values for certain indicators is excessive, estimates can be provided instead. If estimates are provided, it should be clearly indicated as well as the methodology/the basis used for estimation (e.g. evaluation studies and reports, historical average, publications, etc.).</p> <p>b) This indicator refers to the number of persons trained, no matter the number of trainings attended. A person should therefore only be counted once, even if he/she has attended several trainings.</p> <p>c) Under this indicator, RAs account for all the staff that benefitted from training courses on themes related to asylum, and include all the training activities which aim at strengthening the competence of asylum specialists. To provide the required data, RAs collect data on the trained staff who benefitted from activities funded by AMIF and global data on trained staff (provided by the bodies implementing the training activities), so as to be able to express the percentage of those who benefitted from training supported by AMIF. The concept of "trained staff" benefitting from support from AMIF is not limited to the staff of public bodies dealing with asylum, but is extended also to staff from other bodies (i.e. NGOs, non-public bodies) which deal with asylum issues and receive support from AMIF for their training.</p>	Number of persons for a) and percentage for b)	Member States	Annual Financial year	– 2013

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 R4. Number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the ratio of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund, out of the total number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors. It is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund (Member States)</li> <li>b) total number of places adapted for UAM (Member States)</li> <li>c) number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors</li> </ul> <p>Unaccompanied minor as defined in Article 2 of the Reception Conditions Directive (2013/33/EU). Accommodation adapted for unaccompanied minors as defined in Article 24 of the Reception Conditions Directive.</p>	<p>Numbers of places and percentage</p> <p>Stock at the end of the reporting period.</p>	Member States	Annual financial year –	2013

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>IMPACT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO1 II. Stock of pending cases at first instance, by duration.</b>				
<p>This indicator is broken down in sub-categories such as:</p> <p>a) less than 6 months</p> <p>b) more than 6 months</p> <p>Definition:</p> <p>This indicator refers to the stock of applications for which decisions in first instance are still pending. It includes all cases under consideration by the national authority responsible for the first instance determination of the application for international protection (until the first instance decision has been issued) at the end of the reference period (i.e. last day of the reference month).</p> <p>The total number is broken down by duration of pending number of days from the date of lodging the application to the end of the reference period, in line with Article 31 of the recast APD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Less than 6 months: pending for 182 calendar days or less;</li> <li>2. More than 6 months: pending for 183 calendar days or more.</li> </ol> <p>The data from 2023 covers from 01 January 2023 until 31 June 2023.</p>	Number of cases, duration	EASO and is defined as EPS indicator 2: “Pending cases at first instance”. <sup>20</sup> Data collected by DG HOME.	Annual – Data available on a calendar year basis for final instance decisions. The data will be recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis to correspond to the financial year. <sup>21</sup>	Due to data availability, the baseline will be 2014.

<sup>20</sup> EASO’s Early warning and Preparedness System (EPS) is a data collection system gathering information under indicators focussing on all key stages of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS). Countries provide monthly data to EASO within 15 days, with all 30 EU+ countries (EU Member States plus Norway and Switzerland) contributing. For more information visit the EASO website: <https://www.easo.europa.eu/analysis-and-statistics>

<sup>21</sup> Exceptionally, for 2014, the same calculation was applied as the other financial years as the indicator measures the stock at a certain point in time and reporting less than 12 months for 2014 would be misleading.

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 I2. Share of final positive decisions at the appeal stage.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the share of appealed cases which have a positive outcome.</p> <p><b>Definition:</b></p> <p>Final decision on appeal means a decision granted at the final instance of administrative/judicial asylum procedure and which results from the appeal lodged by the asylum seeker rejected in the preceding stage of the procedure.</p> <p>Evolution of the share of final positive decisions (refugee status and subsidiary protection) taken in appeal stage compared to the number of all final decisions taken in appeal. Final decisions granting national humanitarian protection are not considered as positive decisions but are included in the denominator in the total number of final decisions.</p> <p>Based on Eurostat data (migr_asydcfina), which will be downloaded from this website by the Commission: <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/migr_asydcfina">http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/migr_asydcfina</a>. The variable is coded as “migr_asydcfina”. The meta-data can be found here: <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/EN/migr_asydec_esms.htm">http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/EN/migr_asydec_esms.htm</a>.</p> <p><b>The information reported by the Member States is the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- total final positive decisions in appeal stage (refugee status and subsidiary protection)</li> <li>- total all final decisions in appeal stage</li> <li>- those numbers expressed as a ratio</li> </ul>	Numbers of decisions and percentage	Eurostat (migr_asydcfina). Data collected by DG HOME.	Annual – Data available on a calendar year basis for final instance decisions. Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>22</sup>	2013

<sup>22</sup> Exceptionally, for 2014, the same calculation was applied as the other financial years. This is so the share would not be arbitrarily decreased.

When transforming the figures from the calendar year to the financial year, no weight was given to the population size (i.e. population size was assumed to remain the same)

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 I3. Number of persons in the reception system (stock at the end of the reporting period)</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the number of persons in the reception system. This includes all persons who have applied for international protection in the reporting state and are effectively under the reception system, as a measure of stock of persons in the reception system at the end of the reporting month.</p> <p>The reception system is understood as the set of arrangements in place to accommodate asylum applicants as per the recast Reception Conditions Directive point 8 (Directive 2013/33/EU).</p> <p>Each person is to be reported individually: if a family is receiving reception, each family member shall be reported. For example, a family composed of four persons shall be reported as four persons in the reception system.</p>	Number of persons	EASO - EPS indicator 7: Number of persons in the reception system (stock at the end of the reporting period.)	Annual – data available on a monthly basis.  The data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	Due to data availability, the baseline is the 2015 calendar year.
<b>SO1 I4. Number of persons in the reception system as compared to the number of asylum applicants (migr_asyappctza)</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the ratio of the number of persons in the accommodation system out of the total number of asylum applicants. It is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) number of persons in the reception system (stock at end of the reporting period) (EASO).</li> <li>b) asylum applicants (Eurostat migr_asyappctza).</li> <li>c) Number of persons in the reception system as compared to the number of asylum applicants</li> </ul>	Numbers of persons and percentage. Number for a) and b), and ratio for c).	<p>EASO + Eurostat (migr_asyappctza)</p> <p>For a) data to retrieve from EASO, EPS indicator 7</p> <p>For b) data collected by Eurostat using the variable <a href="#">“migr_asyappctza”</a></p>	Annual – The data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>23</sup>	2013, except for “a) number of persons in the reception system..” which sets the baseline as the 2015 calendar year due to data availability.

<sup>23</sup> Exceptionally, for 2014, the same calculation was applied as the other financial years as the indicator measures the stock at a certain point in time and reporting less than 12 months for 2014 would be misleading.

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
SO1 I5. Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) as compared to the number of unaccompanied minors.				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the ratio of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) out of the total number of unaccompanied minors. It is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (Member States)</li> <li>b) asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors (Eurostat migr_asyunaa)</li> <li>c) Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) as compared to the number of unaccompanied minors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Number of places.</li> <li>b) Number of unaccompanied minors.</li> <li>c) is the ratio calculated on a) and b).</li> </ul>	<p>For a) data will be provided by Member States.</p> <p>For b) data available in Eurostat (migr_asyunaa), The meta-data can be extracted using <a href="#">this</a> link:</p>	Annual – For a) it is reported by the MS on financial year. For b), the data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013
SO1 I6. Convergence of first instance/final instance recognition rates by Member States for asylum applicants from a same third country.				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution towards the convergence of recognition rates by MS for asylum seekers from a same third country. A proper implementation, at Member State level, of the standards for qualification laid down in Directive 2011/95/EU should lead towards an increased convergence of the recognition rates. Calculation: The recognition rate is calculated based on the difference between the EU average of the recognition rate for a specific nationality of asylum applicants and the recognition rate of a Member State for the same nationality of asylum seekers.</p> <p>The recognition rate is the total number of decisions granting international protection at 1<sup>st</sup> instance, divided by the total number of decisions at 1<sup>st</sup> instance (including positive and negative decisions).</p> <p>The total number of decisions granting international protection at 1<sup>st</sup> instance is composed of decisions granting refugee status (Geneva Convention) and subsidiary protection.</p> <p>To ensure consistency, only first instance decisions are included. Decisions at the appeal stage are not included, as the data as reported by Member States is less consistent.</p> <p>Only data from years for which a MS had at least 100 asylum applicants from the selected nationality was taken into account, all other data points are marked as NA.</p>	Percentage points	Eurostat (migr_asydcfsta)	Annual – The data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013

Specific Objective: To strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>For the <b>ex post</b> evaluation, Afghan applicants were the selected nationality of asylum applicants.</p> <p>When transforming the figures from the calendar year to the financial year, no weight was given to the population size (i.e. population size was assumed to remain the same).</p> <p>As the indicator is calculated as percentage points from the average:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- negative values mean that the recognition rate is below the EU average</li> <li>- positive values mean that the recognition rate is above the EU average</li> <li>- 0 means that there is no gap between the MS recognition rate and the EU average, thus it can be seen as a measure of full convergence to the EU average.</li> </ul>				

### *SO2: Legal Migration and Integration*

Specific Objective: To support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of the Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>OUTPUT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO2 C3. Number of local, regional and national policy frameworks/measures/tools in place for the integration of third-country nationals and involving civil society and migrant communities, as well as all other relevant stakeholders, as a result of the measures supported under the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of frameworks/measures/tools	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>SO2 C4. Number of cooperation projects with other Member States on the integration of third-country nationals supported under the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of projects	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific Objective: To support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of the Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO2 C5. Number of projects supported under the Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate integration policies in Member States</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of projects	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO2 R1. Number of target group persons who participated in pre-departure measures supported under the Fund.</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014).</p> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>The target group for pre-departure measures is defined in Article 8 and in Recital 21 of Regulation (EU) No 516/2014. Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 lists actions which could be supported by the Fund in the context of pre-departure measures.</p> <p>Examples of pre-departure measures: information provision through one-to-one counselling sessions/ specifically developed material, skills development, job matching, recognition of qualifications (for more examples: <a href="http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/Headstart_to_Integration.pdf">http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/Headstart_to_Integration.pdf</a> ).</p>	Number of persons	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

**Specific Objective:** To support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of the Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals

Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO2 R2. Number of target group persons assisted by the Fund through integration measures in the framework of national, local and regional strategies:</b> <b>i) number of target group persons assisted through measures focusing on education and training, including language training and preparatory actions to facilitate access to the labour market,</b> <b>ii) number of target group persons supported through the provision of advice and assistance in the area of housing,</b> <b>iii) number of target group persons assisted through the provision of health and psychological care,</b> <b>iv) number of target group persons assisted through measures related to democratic participation.</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014).</p> <p>a) The common indicator is broader than the subcategory indicators and therefore it includes all types of assistance provided by the Fund through integration measures in the framework of national, local and regional strategies. The value of the common indicator should, in principle, be higher than any one of the subcategory indicators. Persons taking part in various assistance activities falling under various subcategory indicators will be counted under each relevant sub-category. In the common indicator these persons will only be counted once.</p> <p>b) The target group for integration measures is defined in Article 9 and in Recital 21 of Regulation (EU) 516/2014. It doesn't exclude private accommodation or finding/searching on the housing market. The sub-categories refer to the actions defined in Article 9 of the Regulation. For the subcategory referring to 'democratic participation': according to the European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals (COM(2011)455), "Measures to enhance democratic participation could include training and mentors, granting migrants access to voting rights in local elections, creating local, regional and national consultative bodies, encouraging entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation."</p> <p>c) Preparatory actions should be any action designed with the objective to facilitate access to the labour market. It can take many different forms, depending on the context in the different Member States. It could be CV drafting, diploma translation and/or equivalence, coaching for job interviews, etc. Education and training measures will support persons in gaining/learning knowledge of or skills in something. It can be the language of the Member State, the socio-economic or cultural environment, etc.</p>	Numbers of persons	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific Objective: To support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of the Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>IMPACT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO2 I1. Share of third-country nationals (TCNs) having received long-term residence status out of all TCNs.</b>				
<p>Definition:</p> <p>This indicator expresses the share of TCNs having received long-term residence status out of all TCNs.</p>	Percentage of TCNs having received long-term residence status out of all TCNs.	Eurostat (migr_resshare)	Annual – calendar year. The data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>24</sup>	2013
<b>SO2 I2. Employment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals.</b>				
<p>The employment rate is the percentage of employed persons aged 15 to 64 in relation to the comparable total population. the indicator is calculated as the difference between the employment rate of TCNs and the employment rate of host country nationals. Therefore, a negative percentage point indicates the employment rate of TCNs is lower.</p> <p>‘Third-country national’ means any person who is not a citizen of the Union within the meaning of Article 20(1) TFEU. In the European Union, the term is often used, together with "foreign national" and "non-EU foreign national", to refer to individuals who are neither from the EU country in which they are currently living or staying, nor from other member states of the European Union.</p> <p>The data to compute these two indicators are taken from EU-LFS, where it is possible to</p>	Percentage points in employment rate between TCNs and host country nationals).	Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_ergan).	Annual – calendar year <sup>25</sup> . The data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>26</sup>	2013

<sup>24</sup> When transforming the figures from the calendar year to the financial year, no weight was given to the population size (i.e. population size was assumed to remain the same).

<sup>25</sup> Data can be collected both quarterly and annually

<sup>26</sup> Exceptionally, for 2014, the same calculation was applied as the other financial years. This is so the percentage point difference would not be arbitrarily decreased.

Specific Objective: To support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of the Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>calculate the employment rate by age, sex, citizenship.</p> <p>One of the main results of an effective integration policy is to provide TCNs with the opportunity to access the labour market and participate to the economic and social life of their communities. The reduction of the gap in unemployment of TCNs cannot be the result of a single programme / policy, but a link between this result and the AMIF contribution to the national integration policies is evident.</p> <p>More details on the statistical concepts are provided <a href="#">here</a></p>				
SO2 I3. Unemployment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals.				
<p>Definition:</p> <p>An unemployed person is defined by Eurostat, according to the guidelines of the International Labour Organization, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• someone aged 15 to 74 (in Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom, Iceland, Norway: 16 to 74 years);</li> <li>• without work during the reference week;</li> <li>• available to start work within the next two weeks (or has already found a job to start within the next three months);</li> <li>• actively having sought employment at some time during the last four weeks.</li> </ul> <p>The unemployment rate is the number of people unemployed as a percentage of the labour force. This indicator is broadly calculated as the difference between the unemployment rate for the host country nationals and the TCNs for the age-group 15-74. Therefore, a negative percentage point indicates TCNs have higher rates of unemployment.</p>	Percentage points	Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_urgan)	Annual – calendar year <sup>27</sup> . The data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>28</sup>	2013

<sup>27</sup> Data can be collected both quarterly and annually

<sup>28</sup> Exceptionally, for 2014, the same calculation was applied as the other financial years. This is so the percentage point difference would not be arbitrarily decreased.

**Specific Objective:** To support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of the Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals

Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO2 I4. Activity rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals.</b>				
This indicator is calculated as the difference in the activity rate between TCNs and host-country nationals. The activity rate represents active persons aged 15 to 64 as a percentage of the total population of the same age group. Therefore, a negative percentage point indicates TCNs have lower activity rates.	Percentage points	Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_argan)	Annual – calendar year. The data will be recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>29</sup>	2013
<b>SO2 I5. Share of early leavers from education and training: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals.</b>				
<p>This indicator will allow to analyse the trend over the implementation periods of the AMIF in an area which is highly regarded as meaningful for integration. It is defined as the difference between the host country nationals population aged 18-24 with at most lower secondary education and not in further education or training, and the same population of TCNs. Therefore, a negative value indicates TCNs have a higher rate of early leavers from education and training.</p> <p>Early leavers from education and training denotes the percentage of the population aged 18 to 24 having attained at most lower secondary education and not being involved in further education or training. The numerator of the indicator refers to persons aged 18 to 24 who meet the following two conditions: (a) the highest level of education or training they have completed is ISCED 2011 level 0, 1 or 2 (ISCED 1997: 0, 1, 2 or 3C short); and (b) they have not received any education or training (i.e. neither formal nor non-formal) in the four weeks preceding the survey. The denominator in the total population consists of the same age group, excluding the respondents who have not answered the questions 'highest level of education or training successfully completed' and 'participation in education and training'.</p>	Percentage points	Eurostat - Labour force survey using the variable name "edat_lfse_02".	Annual – calendar year. The data will be recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>30</sup>	2013

<sup>29</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>30</sup> Ibidem.

Specific Objective: To support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of the Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO2 I6. Share of 30 to 34-years-olds with tertiary educational attainment: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals.</b>				
This indicator is calculated as the difference between the share of 30 to 34-years-olds TCNs with tertiary educational attainment and the share of the 30 to 34-years-olds host-country nationals.	Percentage points	Eurostat - Labour force survey. The name of the variable is "edat_lfs_9911".	Annual – calendar year. The data will be recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year. <sup>31</sup>	2013
<b>SO2 I7. Share of population at risk of social poverty or social exclusion: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals.</b>				
<p>This indicator is computed as the difference in the share of population at risk of social poverty or social exclusion (defined as the population aged 18 and over) between host-country nationals and TCNs. Therefore, a neagitve value indicates TCNs are at a higher risk of social poverty or social exclusion.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/FR/ilc_esms.htm">http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/FR/ilc_esms.htm</a> .</p> <p>It is proposed to use this indicator to measure the improvement of social inclusion at the launch and after closure of the AMIF. As clarified under "employment rate" AMIF contributes to the implementation of national policies aimed at promoting integration of TCNs, and these policies benefit also from other funds and incentives.</p>	Percentage points	For the base year of 2013, the data source is: Eurostat (ilc_peps05)For 2015-2022, the data source is: Eurostat (ilc_peps05n) <sup>32</sup>	Annual – calendar year <sup>33</sup> . The data will be recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem

<sup>32</sup> During the implementation period, Eurostat revised the method of measuring the share of the population at risk of social poverty or social exclusion. As the measurement system for both indicators is similar, the baseline is still relevant. However, the data from 2014 is not included in order to hold consistency and rely solely upon the newer indicator for the years of implementation.

<sup>33</sup> The various statistics are generally presented on an annual basis (the survey year, whatever the underlying income reference period), although certain longitudinal indicators may cover a longer period (e.g. 4 years).

*SO3: Return*

**Specific Objective:** To enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States supporting the fight against illegal immigration with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit

Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>OUTPUT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO3 C4. Number of projects supported under the Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate return policies in Member States</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of projects	Member States	Annual financial year	– 2013
<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO3 R1. Number of persons trained on return-related topics with the assistance of the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014).  a) This indicator refers to the number of persons trained, no matter the number of trainings they attended. A person should therefore only be counted once, even if he has attended several trainings.	Number of persons	Member States	Annual financial year	– 2013
<b>SO3 R2. Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)  a) This indicator refers to the number of returnees, no matter the type(s) or amount of assistance received. A returnee should therefore only be counted once, even if it has received more than one form of assistance. This indicator measures reintegration assistance provided pre (ex-ante) and post (ex-post) return. The pre return reintegration assistance can take place in the Member State. All and any assistance can be included but the assistance must be measureable or traceable in case of monitoring or auditing. In-kind assistance should be included.	Number of persons	Member States	Annual financial year	– 2013
<b>SO3 R3. Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund, persons who returned voluntarily and persons who were removed.</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Numbers of persons	Member States	Annual	– 2013

Specific Objective: To enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States supporting the fight against illegal immigration with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>EU 516/2014).</p> <p>This indicator shall be further broken down in sub-categories such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- who returned voluntarily</li> <li>- who were removed</li> <li>- whose return was co-financed by the Fund</li> </ul> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) This indicator refers to all return operations (voluntary, assisted voluntary, forced) which were co-financed by the Fund, regardless of the percentage of co-financing. The indicator refers to direct costs: costs which are identifiable and necessary for the implementation of the return. Small administrative consumables, supplies and general services should not be considered as direct costs.</p> <p>b) The indicator aims at measuring the number of returns co-financed. Therefore, if a direct link between the campaign and the return (being part of a package for example) cannot be established, it should not be counted. The information campaign should be part of the return package; a stand-alone campaign should not count as a "return".</p>			financial year	
<b>SO3 R4. Number of monitored removal operations co-financed by the Fund.</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)</p> <p>a) Number of monitored removal operations that were co-financed by the Fund. The legal reference is art 8(6) of the Return Directive, which is quite generic and says that the MSs shall provide for an effective forced return monitoring system, and section 8 of the Return Handbook - Annex to Commission Recommendation C (2015) 6250. In practice, each monitored removal operation (i.e. return flight successfully arriving in country of return) should be counted once, irrespective of the number of persons leaving the MS in the context of that operation.</p>	Number of operations	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

**Specific Objective:** To enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States supporting the fight against illegal immigration with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit

Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO3 R5. Numbers of removals supported by the Fund, as compared to the total number of returns following an order to leave.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the number of forced returns (persons) supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of TCNs returned following an order to leave. This indicator provides a proxy for the sustainability of effective returns with the support of the Fund, using an overall estimate on the number of returns from each Member State. It is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of persons who were removed (and whose return was co-financed by the Fund) (Member States)</li> <li>- total number of returns following an order to leave (Eurostat migr_eirtn). Due to data availability, indicators so3i1v1a (Number of third-country nationals returned following an order to leave) and so3r5v1b (Total number of returns following an order to leave) have been considered the same.</li> <li>- Numbers of removals supported by the Fund, as compared to the total number of returns following an order to leave (ratio R5a/R5b)</li> </ul>	Numbers of persons	Member States + Eurostat (migr_eirtn)	Annual – calendar year. Eurostat data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013
<b>SO3 R6. Number of persons returned in the framework of the joint return operations supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of returns supported by the Fund.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the number of joint return operations supported by the Fund out of all the returns supported by the Fund. It is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of persons returned in the framework of joint return operations (assisted-voluntary and forced) supported by the Fund</li> <li>- total number of returns (assisted-voluntary and forced) supported by the Fund (EU 516/2014 Annex IV (c) (iii))</li> <li>- Number of persons returned in the framework of the joint return operations supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of returns supported by the Fund (ratio R6a/R6b)</li> </ul>	Numbers of persons	Member States	Annual – Financial year	2013

**Specific Objective: To enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States supporting the fight against illegal immigration with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit**

Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO3 R7. Number of returnees who have received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund, as compared to the total number of voluntary returns supported by the Fund.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the number of persons who received pre or post return reintegration assistance supported by the Fund, as compared to the total number of voluntary returns supported by the Fund.</p> <p>It is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of persons who have received pre or post return reintegration assistance supported by the Fund (EU 516/2014 Annex IV (c) (i))</li> <li>- total number of voluntary returns (persons) supported by the Fund (EU 516/2014 Annex IV (c) (iii)). Reintegration assistance could consist of, inter alia, business start-up, training and mediation, lodging and health care.</li> <li>- Number of returnees who have received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund, as compared to the total number of voluntary returns supported by the Fund (ratio R7a/R7b)</li> </ul>	Numbers of persons	Member States	Annual financial year –	2013
<b>SO3 R8. Number of places in detention centers created/renovated with support from the Fund, as compared to the total number of places in detention centres.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund, as compared to the total number of places in detention centres.</p> <p>It is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund</li> <li>- total number of places in detention centres</li> <li>- Number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund, as compared to the total number of places in detention centres (ratio R8a/R8b)</li> </ul> <p>This indicator refers to the number of places in detention centres which are created or renovated with support from the Fund. In order to ascertain the importance of the fund, it is necessary to calculate a ratio and confront this number with the total number of places in detention centres.</p>	Number of places and percentage	Member States	Annual financial year –	2013

Specific Objective: To enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States supporting the fight against illegal immigration with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit				
Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>IMPACT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO3 I1. Number of returns following an order to leave compared to the number of TCN ordered to leave.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the number of return decisions which are effectively followed by a return.</p> <p>This indicator is based on two sets of data and a ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of TCN returned following an order to leave (migr_eirtn)</li> <li>- Number of TCN ordered to leave (migr_eiord).</li> <li>- Number of returns following an order to leave compared to the number of third-country nationals ordered to leave (ratio I1a/I1b)</li> </ul> <p>Each person is only counted once, irrespective of the number of notices issued to the same person.</p>	Absolute numbers	Eurostat (migr_eiord for SO3 I1.b) + migr_eirtn for SO3 I1.a)	Annual – calendar year. Eurostat data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013
<b>SO3 I2. Return decisions issued to rejected asylum applicants.</b>				
<p>This indicator measures the evolution of the return decisions. It includes all persons covered in administrative or judicial return decisions issued during the reporting month following the withdrawal or rejection of an application for international protection as provided for in Article 19(3) of Regulation (EU) No 604/2013. The return decision must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State or declare the stay of a third-country national to be illegal and impose or state an obligation to leave the territory of the reporting country (or, alternatively, the territory of EU Member States and Norway and Switzerland), and;</li> <li>- Be issued in accordance with the provisions of the EC Return Directive 2008/115/EC or, if applicable, in accordance with national law.</li> </ul> <p>Statistical unit:</p> <p>Persons included in the return decision. Each person is to be reported individually: if a decision covers several family members, each family member shall be reported. For example, a single decision for four persons shall be reported as four return decisions. Multiple decisions per person may be counted during the same reporting month.</p>	Absolute numbers of return decisions issued to rejected asylum applicants.	EUAA, the variable name is: EPS indicator 8a)	Annual – calendar year. Data will be recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013

**Specific Objective:** To enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States supporting the fight against illegal immigration with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit

Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO3 I3. Effective returns of rejected asylum applicants.</b>				
<p><b>Definition:</b></p> <p>This indicator measures the evolution of the effective returns. It includes all persons who left the territory of the EU+ countries during the reporting month, either through voluntary departure or by forced return (removal), in compliance with a return decision issued by the reporting country following the withdrawal or rejection of their application for international protection.</p> <p><b>Reference period:</b> The reporting date should refer to the date of when the return took place.</p> <p><b>Statistical unit:</b></p> <p>Persons who were effectively returned to a third country. Each person is to be reported individually. If a family is returned, each family member shall be reported. For example, a family composed of four persons is returned it shall be reported as four returns.</p>	Number of effective returns of rejected asylum applicants.	EUAA - variable name: EPS indicator 8b)	Annual – calendar year. Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013

#### ***S04: Solidarity***

**Specific Objective:** To enhance solidarity and responsibility-sharing between the Member States, in particular towards those most affected by migration and asylum flows, including through practical cooperation

Definition / Clarification	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO4 R1. Number of applicants and beneficiaries of international protection transferred from one Member State to another with support of the Fund.</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of persons	Member States	Annual – Financial year	2013
<b>SO4 R2. Number of cooperation projects with other Member States on enhancing solidarity and responsibility sharing between the Member States supported under the Fund.</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 516/2014)	Number of projects	Member States	Annual – Financial year	2013

### *Horizontal indicators*

(Indicators on efficiency, added value and sustainability, as established in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207)

H1: Number of Full Time Equivalent in the Responsible Authority, the Delegated Authority and the Audit Authority working on the implementation of the Fund and paid by the technical assistance or national budgets as compared to:

the number of projects implemented

the amount of the funds claimed for the financial year

H2:

Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost

Amount of funds claimed for the financial year

Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost of projects as compared to the amount of funds claimed for the financial year (ratio H2a/H2b)

H3:

Amount of the accounts submitted by the Member State

Total amount of funds allocated to the national programme

Absorption rate of the Fund (ratio H3a/3b)

### **Indicators by specific objectives – ISF**

This section presents the common indicators contained in the Regulation (EU) No 513/2014 (ISF Police), 515/2014 (ISF Borders) and the result and impact indicators contained in the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/207 of 3 October 2016.

RAs report annually on the common indicators in the Annual Implementation Report (AIR) in SFC.

For the indicators listed below, further information is provided to help the RAs to collect the data and prepare the interim evaluation report: i) Data source; ii) Measurement unit; iii) Reference period; iv) Definition, and v) Useful information where necessary.

The measurement unit and the reference period are reported for each indicator. The indicators are organised by specific objective, following Article 3 of the Regulation (EU) No 513/2014, Article 3 of the Regulation (EU) No 515/2014 and Annex III of the Delegated Regulation on CMEF.

*SO1: Visa*

Specific objective - Supporting a common visa policy to facilitate legitimate travel, provide a high quality of service to visa applicants and ensure equal treatment of third-country nationals and tackle illegal migration				
Definition - clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>OUTPUT INDICATOR</b>				
<b>SO1 C3: Number of specialised posts in third countries supported by the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)  The indicator is broken down into sub-categories: 1) immigration liaison officers; 2) others.	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO1 R1: Number of Schengen Evaluation missions in the area of visa carried out with support of the Internal Security Fund ("Fund")</b>				
COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) No 1053/2013.  The number of Schengen evaluation missions are included in the annual evaluation programme (types of missions include: periodic evaluation, first-time evaluation, and thematic evaluation. The Schengen evaluation mechanism (established by COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) No 1053/2013), entered into force on 14 November 2014. It is only after this date that the Schengen evaluations are carried out under the overall coordinating role of the Commission and financed under the ISF Visa and Borders.	Number	European Commission (HOME B.2 Schengen Governance)	Annual – calendar year. Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013,
<b>SO1 R2: Number of consular cooperation activities developed with the help of the Fund</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)  The indicator is broken down into sub-categories:  1) co-locations;  2) common application centres;  3) representations;  4) others.	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific objective - Supporting a common visa policy to facilitate legitimate travel, provide a high quality of service to visa applicants and ensure equal treatment of third-country nationals and tackle illegal migration				
Definition - clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 R3: Number of staff trained and number of training courses in aspects related to the common visa policy with the help of the Fund</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)</p> <p>To be split as following:</p> <p>SO1 C2.1: Number of staff trained in common visa policy related aspects with the help of the Fund</p> <p>SO1 C2.2: Number of training courses (hours completed).</p> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>The interpretation of the indicator "number of training courses (hours completed)" was clarified in the past for Borders: the indicator is based on hours of training delivered. In the AIR, the RA will indicate the cumulative amount of hours of training delivered during the financial year.</p> <p>2) In general, the duration of the training courses is limited to the hours spent for training purposes hence it is a good practice to take out lunch breaks if these last an hour or more. However, there is no need to deduct also the shorter breaks.</p>	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>SO1 R4: Percentage and number of consulates developed or upgraded with the help of the Fund out of the total number of consulates</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)</p> <p>To be split as following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percentage of consulates developed or upgraded with the help of the Fund out of the total number of consulates</li> <li>- Number of consulates developed or upgraded with the help of the Fund out of the total number of consulates.</li> </ul>	Percentage and Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific objective - Supporting a common visa policy to facilitate legitimate travel, provide a high quality of service to visa applicants and ensure equal treatment of third-country nationals and tackle illegal migration				
Definition - clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 R5: Number of Schengen Evaluations recommendations in the area of visas addressed with the support of the Fund, as compared to the total number of recommendations issued (a/b)</b>				
<p>Number of recommendations provided by the MS</p> <p>To be split as following:</p> <p>a) Number of Schengen Evaluation recommendations in the area of visas addressed with the support of the Fund</p> <p>b) Total number of Schengen Evaluation recommendations issued.</p> <p>COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) No 1053/2013.</p> <p>The number of Scheval recommendations concern regular evaluations and unannounced on-site visits. Are excluded, the recommendations given by a MS (following the participation of the MS to a Schengen evaluation) to another MS. These should not be reported.</p>	Number	Member States	Annual - financial year	2014
<b>SO1 R6: Number of persons using fraudulent travel documents detected at consulates supported by the Fund.</b>				
<p>To be split as following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of persons with fraudulent documents applying for a Schengen visa</li> <li>- Total number of persons applying for a Schengen visa.</li> </ul> <p>The term "Travel document" refers to all the documents which persons are entitled to travel with (including visas).</p> <p>The term "fraudulent" refers to false, counterfeit or forged.</p>	Percentage and Number	Member States - Consulates	Annual - financial year	2013
<b>IMPACT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO1 I1: Number of visa applicants having to apply for a Schengen visa outside of their country of residence</b>				
<p>The place and date of application, as well as the applicant's home address is registered in the VIS.</p> <p>The indicator concerns only the applicants who need to go in another country to apply for a visa because there is no consulate present in the country of the applicant nor a consulate of another MS representing the MS.</p>	Number of persons	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013

Specific objective - Supporting a common visa policy to facilitate legitimate travel, provide a high quality of service to visa applicants and ensure equal treatment of third-country nationals and tackle illegal migration				
Definition - clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO1 I2: Number of visa required countries in the world where the number of Member States present or represented has increased</b>				
<p>Intended as a EU-level indicator, in line with its wording.</p> <p>Every year, two values are calculated, notably number of VISA required countries where the number of Member States present or represented has increased compared to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the previous year</li> <li>- 2015 (first year with available data)</li> </ul> <p>Visa required countries have been identified in line with the common list for the EU published on DG HOME portal, excluding administrative regions, entities etc.</p> <p>Due to the way in which the indicator is phrased, it is not possible to convert this information from calendar to financial year.</p>	Number	European Commission (HOME.B4: Visa Policy)	Annual - calendar year.	2015 – the first year with data available

*SO2: Border*

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>OUTPUT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO2 C2: Number of border control (checks and surveillance) infrastructure and means developed or upgraded with the help of the Fund</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)</p> <p>The indicator is broken down into sub-categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Infrastructure;</li> <li>2) Fleet (air, land, sea borders);</li> <li>3) Equipment;</li> <li>4) Others</li> </ol>	Number	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) Infrastructures are non-moveable objects, such as buildings.</p> <p>Equipments are moveable objects. In the case of IT system, large-scale IT infrastructures are considered as infrastructure, small IT equipments are considered as equipments.</p> <p>b) The indicators should be counted until the end of the eligibility period (period covered: 1 Jan 2014 to 31.12.2022).</p> <p>c) All equipment should be counted, not high value investments only.</p> <p>d) Only the number of infrastructure should be counted, not the upgrades.</p>				
RESULT INDICATORS				
SO2 R1: Number of staff trained and number of training courses in aspects related to border management with the help of the Instrument				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)</p> <p>To be split as following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of staff trained in border management related aspects with the help of the Fund</li> <li>- Number of training courses in border management related aspects with the help of the Fund</li> </ul>	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
SO2 R2: Number of border crossings of the external borders through ABC gates supported by the Instrument out of the total number of border crossings				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)</p> <p>To be split as following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of border crossings of the external borders through ABC gates supported by the Fund</li> <li>- Total number of border crossings</li> </ul>	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO2 R3: Number of Schengen Evaluation missions in the area of borders carried out with the support of the Fund</b>				
The number of Schengen evaluation missions are included in the annual evaluation programme (type of missions include: periodic evaluation, first-time evaluation, and thematic evaluation. The Schengen evaluation mechanism (established by COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) No 1053/2013), entered into force on 14 November 2014. It is only after this date that the Schengen evaluations are carried out under the overall coordinating role of the Commission and financed under the ISF Visa and Borders. As the indicator measures the amount of support by the fund, the baseline for all MS is 0.	Number of evaluations missions	Provided by the European Commission (HOME.B2: Schengen Governance)	Annual – calendar year. Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013
<b>SO2 R4: Number of Schengen Evaluation recommendations in the area of borders addressed with the support of the Fund, as compared to the total number of recommendations issued (a/b)</b>				
Number of recommendations provided by the MS COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) No 1053/2013 To be split as following: a) Number of Schengen Evaluation recommendations in the area of borders addressed with the support of the Fund b) Total number of Schengen Evaluation recommendations in the area of borders issued	Number	Member States	Annual - financial year	2014
<b>SO2 R5: Number of equipment<sup>34</sup> items used during Frontex Coordinated Operations which were purchased with support of the Funds as compared to the total number of equipment items used for Frontex Coordinated Operations (a/b).</b>				
All equipment with a value > than EUR 10.000. To be split as following: a) Number of equipment items used during Frontex Coordinated Operations which were purchased with support of the Fund	Number of equipment items.	FRONTEX - The data for 2023 covers from 01 January 2023 until 30	Annual – financial year	2013

<sup>34</sup> Amounting to above 10 000 euro per item.

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>b) Total number of equipment items used for Frontex Coordinated Operations</p> <p>As these indicators analyse the amount of support provided to Frontex Coordinated Operations by equipment items purchased with support of the ISF compared to all equipment items used in Frontex Coordinated operations, and to the transnational nature of these operations and their supporting equipment, this indicator is better suited for analysis at the EU level.</p> <p>Furthermore, to further define the scope of the indicator, the following types of equipment, which are generally above EUR 10.000, shall be included: (i) offshore patrol vessels; (ii) coastal patrol vessels; (iii) coastal patrol boats; (iv) fixed wing aircrafts; (v) helicopters; (vi) unmanned aerial vehicles; (vii) canine team vehicles; (viii) mobile office / laboratory; (ix) patrol car; (x) vehicles equipped for border surveillance; (xi) thermal cameras (xii) heart beat detectors (xiii) SmatDec cameras.</p> <p>Frontex joint operations are planned and developed on the basis of an Annual Risk Analysis Report which analyses the likely future risk of irregular migration and cross-border crime along the EU external border. During the annual meetings with Member States the agency then prioritises the proposed joint operations on the basis of their importance and the resources available in order to ensure an effective response.</p> <p>Together with the host country Frontex makes an assessment of the number of officers with specific expertise and the quantity and type of technical equipment required. Frontex then directs a request to all Member States and Schengen Associated Countries for the necessary officers, clearly specifying their required profiles (false document experts, border checks, surveillance experts, dog handlers, de-briefers etc) as well as specific equipment needed for the operation (e.g. helicopters, planes, patrol cars, thermo-vision equipment, heart-beat detectors). Those countries then decide on the level of contribution they can make to the joint operation.</p> <p>The Operational Plan clearly defines the aim of each joint operation, where it is to take place and the quantities and types of technical equipment and officers to take part.</p> <p>In the Implementation stage, border guards and technical equipment are deployed to the operational area and carry out their duties according to the operational plan. The deployed officers (guest officers) work under the command and control of the authorities of the country hosting the operation.</p>		June 2023.		

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>IMPACT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO2 I1: Number of national border surveillance infrastructure established/further developed in the framework of Eurosur</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)</p> <p>The indicator is broken down into sub-categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) National Coordination Centres;</li> <li>2) Regional Coordination Centres;</li> <li>3) Local Coordination Centres;</li> <li>4) Other types of coordination centres.</li> </ul>	Number	Member States	Annual – Financial year	2013
<b>SO2 I2: Number of incidents reported by Member States to the European Situational Picture</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex IV of Regulation EU 515/2014)</p> <p>The indicator is broken down into sub-categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Illegal immigration, including incidents relating to a risk to the lives of migrants;</li> <li>2) Cross-border crime;</li> <li>3) Crisis situations.</li> </ul>	Number	Member States	Annual – Financial year	2013

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO2 I3: Number of irregular border crossings detected at EU external borders</b> <b>a) between the BCPs</b> <b>b) at the BCPs</b>				
<p>1. Border: A line separating land territory or maritime zones of two States or subparts of States. It can also refer to a region that is found at the margin of settled and developed territory.</p> <p>2. External borders refer to the borders between Member States and third countries. The borders between Schengen Associated Countries (Liechtenstein, Norway, Iceland and Switzerland) and third countries are also considered as external borders. The borders between Schengen Associated Countries and Schengen Member States are considered as internal borders.</p> <p>3. Border crossing points (BCP): any crossing-point between two States authorised by the competent authorities for the crossing of external borders.</p> <p>4. Border crossing: The physical act of crossing a border either at a border crossing point or another point along the border.</p> <p>5. Irregular border crossing: Crossing borders without complying with the necessary requirements for legal entry into the receiving State. The entry of a non-EU national into a Schengen State without complying with the requirements laid down in the Schengen Borders Code (Regulation 562/2006).</p>	Number of crossings, implying that if a person crosses twice it is counted twice.	FRONTEX <sup>35</sup>	Annual – Financial year	2013

<sup>35</sup> Data sent by Frontex and covering the period January 2012 to September 2016. NB: data cannot be released publicly (only for internal use).

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO2 I4: Number of searches in Schengen Information System (SIS II).</b>				
<p>Both national and central systems are concerned.</p> <p>The Schengen Information System - SIS II - allows information exchange between national border controls, customs and police authorities, ensuring that the free movement of people within the EU can take place in a safe environment.</p> <p>Pursuant to Article 50(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1987/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council (hereafter referred to as the “SIS II Regulation”) and parallel provision in Article 66(3) of Council Decision 2007/533/JHA2 (hereafter referred to as the “SIS II Decision”), each year the Management Authority shall publish statistics on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the number of records per category of alert,</li> <li>b) the number of hits per category of alert,</li> <li>c) how many times SIS II was accessed, in total and for each Member State</li> </ul> <p>Definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Access to SIS II entails both: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Any query, regardless of whether a hit is made or not and whether the Central System or a national copy of the SIS II database is queried;</li> <li>b. Any transaction intended to create/update/delete (CUD) an alert.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Every access is counted, even if an access resulted in an error and an error message was returned from the system (e.g. if the operator commits an error)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) Manual searches, when there is a human intervention: This covers checks by staff using radios, telephones, computer terminals, document scanners and all other forms of “traditional check” where a user makes the decision to carry out a check.</li> <li>3) Automated searches: This covers queries carried out by automatic number plate recognition systems (ANPR) or other forms of automated bulk queries. These systems are</li> </ul>	<p>Number of searches, including manual and automated process. No distinction is made between accesses to SIS II achieved through the Central SIS II or through a national copy of the Central SIS II.</p>	<p>EU-Lisa and SIS II annual report</p>	<p>Annual – Calendar year<sup>36</sup>. Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.</p>	<p>Based on data availability, the baseline is the 2014 calendar year.</p>

<sup>36</sup> Data are released in an annual report usually in April of the following calendar year.

Specific objective – “Supporting integrated border management, ...”				
Definition	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>relevant for alerts under Articles 36 and 38 SIS II Decision.</p> <p>Useful links:</p> <p>SIS II - 2021 Statistics.pdf (europa.eu)</p>				
<b>SO2 I5: Number of persons using fraudulent travel documents detected at the border crossing points</b>				
<p>Number of persons with fraudulent documents crossing the borders at both entry and exit / Total number of persons crossing the borders.</p> <p>The indicator concerns the aggregated number of border crossing points on the territory (land, air, sea).</p> <p>The term "Travel document" refers to all the documents which persons are entitled to travel with (including visa).</p> <p>The term "fraudulent" refers to false, counterfeit or forged.</p>	<p>Number of crossings, implying that if a person crosses twice it is counted twice.</p>	FRONTEX <sup>37</sup>	Annual – Financial year	2013

<sup>37</sup> Data sent by Frontex and covering the period January 2013 to December 2022. They will send the following months update later. NB: data cannot be released publicly. Only for internal use.

**SO5: Crime**

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
OUTPUT INDICATORS				
SO5 C3: Number and financial value of projects in the area of crime prevention				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex II of Regulation EU 513/2014)</p> <p>To be split as following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of projects in the area of crime prevention;</li> <li>- Financial value of projects in the area of crime prevention</li> </ul> <p>The indicator shall also be further broken down by type of crime:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Terrorism;</li> <li>2. trafficking in human beings and sexual exploitation of women and children;</li> <li>3. illicit drug trafficking;</li> <li>4. illicit arms trafficking;</li> <li>5. money laundering;</li> <li>6. corruption;</li> <li>7. counterfeiting of means of payment;</li> <li>8. computer crime;</li> <li>9. organised crime.</li> </ol> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) If the project deals with multiple types of crime, the primary type of crime/the most important (financial value, operational importance) should be selected. If two or more crime types are the main focus, please categorise under one of these.</p> <p>Cybercrime/computer crime only includes cyber offences (i.e. attacks against information systems). It does not include other activities such as drug trafficking where elements such as the sale, payment, or organisation/logistics take place online.</p>	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO5 C4: Number of projects supported by the Fund, aiming to improve law enforcement and information exchange, which are related to Europol data systems, repositories, or communication tools</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex II of Regulation EU 513/2014)</p> <p>The indicator shall be further broken down by type of crime:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data loaders;</li> <li>2. extending access to SIENA;</li> <li>3. projects aimed at improving input to analysis work files</li> <li>4. others.</li> </ol> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) Member States are invited to preferably classify the actions by the Europol tools and services, with a pragmatic approach.</p>	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO5 R1: Number of joint investigation teams (JITs) and European Multidisciplinary Platform against Criminal Threats (EMPACT) operation projects supported by the Fund, including the participating Member States and authorities</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex II of Regulation EU 513/2014)</p> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) As the main principle, data should be reported only by the leaders of JITs and EMPACT projects therefore double counting should be avoided.</p> <p>b) Data on participating authorities include authorities from both leading and participating countries.</p>	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO5 R2: Number of law enforcement officials trained on cross-border related topics with the help of the Fund, and the duration of their training (person days).</b>				
<p>Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex II of Regulation EU 513/2014)</p> <p>To be split as following:</p> <p>Number of law enforcement officials trained on cross-border related topics with the help of the Fund</p> <p>Duration of the training (carried out) on cross-border related topics with the help of the Fund</p> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) The unit of measurement established by the basic acts is "persons/days". For instance - 20 officers x 5 days = 100 person days</p> <p>b) Double counting in the same operations should be avoided. The main topics/policy area should be identified if the training related to many issues.</p>	Number and Duration	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>SO5 R3: Results of actions supported by the Fund leading to the disruption of organised crime groups:</b>				
<p>EMPACT and JITs, substantially supported by EU funding, contribute to the EU objective of dismantling and disrupting organised crime.</p> <p>Council Framework Decision 2008/841/JHA of 24 October 2008 provides for the definition of the criminal organisation and of the offences related to the participation in it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seizures of criminal commodities: drugs as broken down in SO5-I3, counterfeited goods, contraband goods, stolen goods, firearms, environmental crimes</li> <li>2. seizures of cash (value);</li> <li>3. seizures of other assets as appropriate (estimated value);</li> <li>4. takedowns of web domains (number);</li> <li>5. victims identified (for certain crime types);</li> <li>6. persons arrested.</li> </ol>	<p>Estimated value in EUR, with the exception of drugs, where the units indicated in SO5-I3 apply.</p> <p>Number for identified victims.</p>	Member States	Annual – Calendar year.	2013

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>‘Criminal organisation’ means a structured association, established over a period of time, of more than two persons acting in concert with a view to committing offences which are punishable by deprivation of liberty or a detention order of a maximum of at least four years or a more serious penalty, to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit.</p> <p>‘Structured association’ means an association that is not randomly formed for the immediate commission of an offence, nor does it need to have formally defined roles for its members, continuity of its membership, or a developed structure. The Decision provides also for the common rules on jurisdiction and coordination of prosecution.</p> <p>The definitions of specific crime offences are provided by the EU legal basis ( for instance Directive (EU) 2013/40 on the attacks against information systems, Directive 2011/36/EU etc.).</p> <p>Data relate only to the law enforcement operations facilitated by Europol which take place using funding from ISF-Police.</p>				
IMPACT INDICATORS				
SO5 II: Number/value of frozen, seized and confiscated criminal assets as a result of actions within the scope of Regulation (EU) 513/2014				
<p>The Directive 2014/42/EU establishes common definitions and minimum rules on the freezing of property with a view to possible subsequent confiscation of property in criminal matters. It requires Member States to collect relevant statistics, maintain and transmit them to the Commission<sup>38</sup>. As regards the number of not executed orders, Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA requires Member States to inform the Commission of the number of cases where the confiscation order has not been executed.</p> <p>1. Number of freezing orders executed;</p>	<p>Value of property in EUR million.</p> <p>Cases in number.</p>	Member States	Annual – Calendar year.	2013

<sup>38</sup> This Directive establishes common definitions and minimum rules on the freezing of property with a view to possible subsequent confiscation of property in criminal matters. Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA provides legal basis for the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders. It is foreseen that a framework to collect and consolidate data from MSs be put in place by the Commission services. When this becomes operational, the source of statistics for evaluation purposes will be modified accordingly.

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>2. number of confiscation orders executed;</p> <p>3. estimated value of property frozen, at least of property frozen with a view to possible subsequent confiscation at the time of freezing;</p> <p>4. estimated value of property recovered at the time of confiscation;</p> <p>5. number of cases where the confiscation order issued on the basis of the Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA has not been executed.</p> <p>Figures on arrests and seizures/confiscation of criminal assets. Due to the nature of the different crimes, the seizures data (weight, value) cannot be combined into a single figure. The statistics should be looked at within the context of the actions undertaken.</p> <p>The following definitions should apply:</p> <p>(1) ‘proceeds’ means any economic advantage derived directly or indirectly from a criminal offence; it may consist of any form of property and includes any subsequent reinvestment or transformation of direct proceeds and any valuable benefits;</p> <p>(2) ‘property’ means property of any description, whether corporeal or incorporeal, movable or immovable, and legal documents or instruments evidencing title or interest in such property;</p> <p>(3) ‘instrumentalities’ means any property used or intended to be used, in any manner, wholly or in part, to commit a criminal offence or criminal offences;</p> <p>(4) ‘confiscation’ means a final deprivation of property ordered by a court in relation to a criminal offence;</p> <p>(5) ‘freezing’ means the temporary prohibition of the transfer, destruction, conversion, disposal or movement of property or temporarily assuming custody or control of property;</p> <p>(6) ‘criminal offence’ means an offence covered by any of the instruments listed in Article 3 of the Directive</p> <p>Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA provides legal basis for the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders.</p>				

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO5 I2: Number of police-recorded offences, suspects, prosecutions and convictions resulting from actions falling within the scope of Regulation (EU) 513/2014</b>				
<p>Statistics on police-recorded crime and on the criminal justice response, relating to serious and organised crime offences.</p> <p>The UNODC's International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, formally adopted in 2015, provides a good framework for classifying crimes. The EU guidelines, being prepared by Eurostat, will aim at assisting the implementation step by step process focused on the most relevant types of crime for EU statistics.</p> <p>The figures on crime and criminal justice are collected through a joint Eurostat-UNODC data collection. The Eurostat-UNODC data collection replaces earlier series published by Eurostat and refers to the period from 2008 onwards. It is available at country level for European Union Member States, EFTA countries, EU Candidate countries, and EU Potential Candidates.</p> <p>We report for each item the exact data source and Eurostat variable name and other useful definitions</p> <p>1. Police-recorded offences</p> <p>Variable name in Eurostat: crim_off_cat and crim_thb_sex</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <p>Data on offences recorded by the police are to be disaggregated by crime type following these definitions:</p> <p>Data on offences recorded by the police have been disaggregated by crime type following these definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· a) Intentional Homicide: Unlawful death purposefully inflicted on a person by another person. Data on intentional homicide should also include serious assault leading to death and death as a result of a terrorist attack. It should exclude attempted homicide, manslaughter, death due to legal intervention, justifiable homicide in self-defence and death due to armed conflict. (Select ICCS = ICCS0101)</li> <li>· b) Serious assault: Physical attack against the body of another person resulting in serious bodily injury, excluding indecent/sexual assault, threats and slapping/punching. ‘Assault’</li> </ul>	<p>Number. Select</p> <p>UNIT = NR</p>	<p>Eurostat -</p> <p>crim_off_cat, crim_just_ctz and crim_thb_sex</p>	<p>Annual calendar year - Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata in order to correspond to the financial year. Usually, data are available within two years of the reference year.</p>	<p>2013</p>

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>leading to death should also be excluded. (Select ICCS = ICCS02011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· c) Sexual Violence (aggregate of Rape and Sexual Assault): (Select ICCS = ICCS0301)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Rape: Sexual intercourse without valid consent. In the current classification used by the UNODC, offences of statutory rape where the victim is below the age of consent are classified separately as sexual offences against children. (Select ICCS = ICCS03011) b) Sexual Assault: Sexual violence not amounting to rape. It includes an unwanted sexual act, an attempt to obtain a sexual act, or contact or communication with unwanted sexual attention not amounting to rape. It also includes sexual assault with or without physical contact including drug-facilitated sexual assault, sexual assault committed against a marital partner against her/his will, sexual assault against a helpless person, unwanted groping or fondling, harassment and threat of asexual nature. (Select ICCS = ICCS03012)</li> <li>· d) Robbery: Theft of property from a person, overcoming resistance by force or threat of force. Where possible, the category “Robbery” should include muggings (bag -snatching) and theft with violence, but should exclude pick pocketing and extortion. (Select ICCS = ICCS0401)</li> <li>· e) Kidnapping: Unlawfully detaining a person or persons against their will (including through the use of force, threat, fraud or enticement) for the purpose of demanding for their liberation an illicit gain or any other economic gain or other material benefit, or in order to oblige someone to do or not to do something. “Kidnapping” excludes disputes over child custody. (Select ICCS = ICCS02021)</li> <li>· f) Theft: Depriving a person or organisation of property without force with the intent to keep it. “Theft” excludes burglary, housebreaking and robbery, which are recorded separately. (Select ICCS = ICCS0502)</li> <li>· g) Burglary: Gaining unauthorised access to a part of a building/dwelling or other premises, including by use of force, with the intent to steal goods (breaking and entering). “Burglary” should include, where possible, theft from a house, apartment or other dwelling place, factory, shop or office, from a military establishment, or by using false keys. It should exclude theft from a car, from a container, from a vending machine, from a parking meter and from fenced meadow/compound. (Select ICCS = ICCS0501)</li> <li>· h) Unlawful Acts Involving Controlled Drugs or Precursors: Illegal possession, cultivation, production, supplying, transportation, importing, exporting, financing etc. of drug operations which are not solely in connection with personal use. (Select ICCS =</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>ICCS0601)</p> <p>· i) Trafficking in Human Beings: Measured as the number of registered victims. A registered victim can include a person who has been formally identified as a victim of trafficking in human beings by the relevant formal authority in a Member State or a person who has met the criteria of the EU Directive but has not been formally identified by the relevant formal authority as a trafficking victim or who has declined to be formally or legally identified as trafficked.</p> <p>The following three indicators, except Persons Prosecuted for crimes in trafficking in human beings, are included in the Eurostat variable crim_just_ctz and crim_thb_sex. As for value of citizenship we are interested in all persons, therefore we should select CITIZEN = TOTAL. Due to data availability the following three indicators have two values. The first is for all crimes, and a second value which represents the crimes related to trafficking in human beings.</p> <p>2. Persons brought into formal contact with the police and/or criminal justice system</p> <p>Including an aggregate for all types of crime, and a subset indicator for suspects brought into formal contact for with the police/criminal justice system for trafficking in human beings.</p> <p>All crime:</p> <p>Variable name in Eurostat: crim_just_ctz</p> <p>Definition: May include persons suspected, or arrested or cautioned for a criminal offence, at the national level. Select LEG_STAT = PER_SUSP</p> <p>Trafficking in human beings:</p> <p>Variable name in Eurostat: crim_thb_sex</p> <p>Suspects refer to persons brought into formal contact with the police/criminal justice system for trafficking in human beings. “Formal contact” with the police and/or criminal justice system may include persons suspected, or arrested or cautioned, for a criminal offence of trafficking in human beings, at the national level.</p>				

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>3. Prosecuted persons</p> <p>Including an aggregate for all types of crime, and a subset indicator for prosecuted persons.</p> <p>All Crime:</p> <p>Variable name in Eurostat: crim_just_ctz</p> <p>Definition: Alleged offenders against whom prosecution commenced in the reporting year. Persons may be prosecuted by the public prosecutor or the law enforcement agency responsible for prosecution, at the national level, irrespective of the case-ending decision. Select LEG_STAT = PER_PRSC</p> <p>Persons Prosecuted for crimes in trafficking in human beings: <b>Data provided by Eurostat and not publicly available.</b></p> <p>Definition: This number refers to persons against whom legal proceedings have been initiated by the prosecuting authorities.</p> <p>4. Convicted persons</p> <p>Including an aggregate for all types of crime, and a subset indicator for persons found guilty for trafficking in human beings.</p> <p>All crime:</p> <p>Variable name in Eurostat: crim_just_ctz</p> <p>Definition: Persons found guilty by any legal body authorized to pronounce a conviction under national criminal law, whether or not the conviction was later upheld. The total number of persons convicted should also include persons convicted of serious special law offences but exclude persons convicted of minor road traffic offences, misdemeanours and other petty offences. Select LEG_STAT = PER_CNV</p> <p>Trafficking in human beings:</p> <p>Variable name in Eurostat: crim_thb_sex</p> <p>Definition: Persons found guilty for trafficking in human beings by any legal body authorized to pronounce a conviction under national criminal law, whether or not the conviction was later upheld.</p>				

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO5 I3: Quantity of drugs seizure within the scope of the Fund on organised crime</b>				
<p>Council Framework Decision 2004/757/JHA of 25 October 2004 lays down minimum provisions on the constituent elements of criminal acts and penalties in the field of illicit drug trafficking.</p> <p>Other relevant legal basis are:</p> <p>Council Decision 2005/387/JHA of 10 May 2005 on the information exchange, risk-assessment and control of new psychoactive substances.</p> <p>Council Conclusions on improving the monitoring of drug supply in the European Union, of 15 November 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cannabis seizures</li> <li>2. Heroin seizures</li> <li>3. Cocaine seizures</li> <li>4. Amphetamine and methamphetamine seizures</li> <li>5. Ecstasy seizures</li> <li>6. New psychoactive substances notified</li> <li>7. LSD seizures<sup>39</sup></li> </ol> <p>Definitions:</p> <p>1. New psychoactive substance (NPS) means a new narcotic or psychotropic drug, in pure form or in preparation, that is not controlled by the 1961 United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs or the 1971 United Nations Convention on Psychotropic Substances, but which may pose a public health threat comparable to that posed by substances listed in these conventions. The NPS comprise more than 600 types of substances. The two main categories are synthetic cannabinoids (which are sold as</p>	<p>Number</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data on drug seizures relate to all seizures made in each country during the year by all law enforcement agencies (police, customs, National Guard, etc.). Caution is required in relation to double-counting that might occur within a country — although it is usually avoided — between various law enforcement agencies.</li> <li>• Data on seizures is reported by almost all countries both in terms of the number of seizures and the quantity seized. For the purpose of the evaluation we only focus on quantity. Seized quantities of</li> </ul>	<p>EMCDDA</p> <p>This indicator is taken from the EMCDDA (European Monitor Centre for Drugs and Drug addiction) statistical bulletin (points 1 to 6), and from the EU Early Warning System (EU EWS) on new psychoactive substances (NPS) (point 7).</p> <p>The bulletin is released every year in May and presents the latest available data on drug seizure. Data usually refers to two years before the releasing data (e.g. in the 2016 bulletin</p>	<p>Annual – Calendar year (E.g. data for 2014 comprises seizures done between January and December 2014.) Data and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.</p>	<p>2013 for all sub-indicators except New psychoactive substances notified, for which the baseline is the 2014 calendar year due to data availability .</p>

<sup>39</sup> A separate entry for LSD is added since LSD is measured in dose, while all the others in kg.

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>replacements for cannabis - within this category 168 different substances are monitored) and synthetic cathinones (which are sold as replacements for stimulants, such as amphetamine, MDMA and cocaine - within this category 117 different substances are monitored). The seizure data collected on NPS should be regarded as minimum estimates due to the lack of standardised reporting in this area. It should be noted that these data are not directly comparable with the data on established illicit drugs.</p> <p>Note: seizures presented in the bulletin are not restricted to ISF-funded actions, but provide context for assessing the actions either individually or together.</p> <p>Useful links:</p> <p><a href="http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/data/stats2016">http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/data/stats2016</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/edr/trends-developments/2016">http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/edr/trends-developments/2016</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/2637/TDAT16001ENN.pdf">http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/2637/TDAT16001ENN.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/2373/TD0216072ENN.PDF">http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/2373/TD0216072ENN.PDF</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/3353/TD0416736ENN.pdf">http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/3353/TD0416736ENN.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/activities/action-on-new-drugs">http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/activities/action-on-new-drugs</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/408/Monitoring_new_drugs_72902.pdf">http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/408/Monitoring_new_drugs_72902.pdf</a></p> <p>Clarifications:</p> <p>a) The indicator is at the level of impact and should be interpreted to include actions which fall under the typologies foreseen in the Regulation (EU) n° 513/2014, not necessarily (financially) supported from the fund.</p>	<p>cannabis, heroin, cocaine and amphetamine and new psychoactive substances notified are provided in kilograms, of LSD in doses, and of ecstasy in tablets.<sup>40</sup></p> <p>• In the bulletin data Amphetamine and methamphetamine are reported separately. For the purpose of the evaluation, the total number of Kg seizures should be reported (i.e. the sum of the kg in Amphetamine and the kg in methamphetamine)</p>	<p>the latest figures are for 2014). The earliest figures date back to the mid-80s. This data is also used to prepare the European Drug Report, written yearly since 1996, and released in May.</p>		

<sup>40</sup> Quantities seized may fluctuate from one year to another, due to a small number of large seizures. For this reason, the number of seizures is usually considered as a better indicator of trends. In all countries, it includes a major proportion of small seizures from the retail level of the market. All trend data, though, are subject to extraneous influences affecting them, e.g. changes in legislation, changes in police practices, etc.

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO5 I4: Number of protected or assisted crime victims</b>				
<p>Directive 2012/29/EU of 25 October 2012 establishes minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime.</p> <p>In this respect, the victim should be meant as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a natural person who has suffered harm, including physical, mental or emotional harm or economic loss which was directly caused by a criminal offence;</li> <li>- family members of a person whose death was directly caused by a criminal offence and who have suffered harm as a result of that person's death;</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of victims recorded by the law enforcement agencies</li> <li>2. Number of referrals by police to victim support services</li> <li>3. Number of victims that request and receive support</li> <li>4. Number of victims that request and do not receive support</li> </ol> <p>According to the recital 64 of the Directive "as far as such data are known and are available, they should include the number and age and gender of the victims".</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Victim (taken from Directive 2012/29/EU of 25 October )</li> </ul>	Number of persons, number of referrals	<p>Member States<sup>41</sup>.</p> <p>Article 28 of the Directive 2012/29/EU requires Member States to share available data showing how victims have accessed the rights set out in this Directive.</p>	Annual – Financial year. Data available from 2017 onwards.	2017

<sup>41</sup> Member States should provide this indicator. Following Directive 2012/29/EU (the Victims' Rights Directive) Recital 64 provides guidelines for Member State on type of data and how to collect it: "Systematic and adequate statistical data collection is recognised as an essential component of effective policymaking in the field of rights set out in this Directive. In order to facilitate evaluation of the application of this Directive, Member States should communicate to the Commission relevant statistical data related to the application of national procedures on victims of crime, including at least the number and type of the reported crimes and, as far as such data are known and are available, the number and age and gender of the victims. Relevant statistical data can include data recorded by the judicial authorities and by law enforcement agencies and, as far as possible, administrative data compiled by healthcare and social welfare services and by public and non-governmental victim support or restorative justice services and other organisations working with victims of crime. Judicial data can include information about reported crime, the number of cases that are investigated and persons prosecuted and sentenced. Service-based administrative data can include, as far as possible, data on how victims are using services provided by government agencies and public and private support organisations, such as the number of referrals by police to victim support services, the number of victims that request, receive or do not receive support or restorative justice."

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>a natural person who has suffered harm, including physical, mental or emotional harm or economic loss which was directly caused by a criminal offence;</p> <p>family members of a person whose death was directly caused by a criminal offence and who have suffered harm as a result of that person's death;</p>				
<b>SO5 I5: Volume of exchange of information in the Prüm framework</b>				
<p>Prüm: total number of DNA matches ('hits') per year. Matches on DNA profile are counted by both the requesting MS and the requested MS in Prüm, therefore for this indicator the number of matches on DNA per Member State was divided by two to represent the actual total number of matches across the EU.</p> <p>2. Prüm: total number of fingerprint matches ('hits') per year</p> <p>3. Prüm: total number of vehicle registration data matches ('hits') per year</p> <p><i>Clarifications:</i></p> <p>a) The Treaty of Prüm establishes a legal framework to further develop cooperation among Member States in combating terrorism, cross-border crime and illegal immigration. More specifically, it provides for the exchange between the Contracting Parties of data on DNA, fingerprints, vehicle registration, and personal and non-personal data related to cross-border police cooperation. Data collected at EU level is included in DG HOME Statistical compilation (annual report).</p> <p>Council Decision 2008/615/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime lays down the terms and definition of the exchange of information such as</p> <p>(a)provisions on the conditions and procedure for the automated transfer of DNA profiles, dactyloscopic data and certain national vehicle registration data</p> <p>(b) provisions on the conditions for the supply of data in connection with major events with a cross-border dimension</p> <p>(c) provisions on the conditions for the supply of information in order to prevent terrorist offences</p> <p>(d)provisions on the conditions and procedure for stepping up cross-border police cooperation through various measures.</p>	Measured by number of hits, where 0 means that the MS did not establish the bilateral connections with other MS, and therefore there was no exchange.	European Commission (DG HOME Statistical compilation)	Annual – Financial year.	Due to data availability, the baseline is the 2014 calendar year.

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p>For the investigation of criminal offences, the Member States shall, by mutual consent, via their national contact points, compare the DNA profiles of their unidentified DNA profiles with all DNA profiles from other national DNA analysis files' reference data. Profiles shall be supplied and compared in automated form. Unidentified DNA profiles shall be supplied for comparison only where provided for under the requesting Member State's national law.</p> <p>Member States shall ensure the availability of reference data from the file for the national automated fingerprint identification systems established for the prevention and investigation of criminal offences. Reference data shall only include dactyloscopic data and a reference number.</p> <p>Member States shall allow other Member States' national contact points, as referred to in Article 12, access to the following national vehicle registration data, with the power to conduct automated searches in individual cases.</p> <p>b) The source of data is a statistical compilation prepared by DG HOME, hence the template in SFC will be pre-filled with data by the Commission services. The updated version of the list of indicators which was sent to the Evaluation Network as part of the Guidance on 7/02/2017 includes this revision.</p> <p><i>Definitions</i></p> <p>Dactyloscopic data: fingerprint images, images of fingerprint latents, palm prints, palm print latents and templates of such images that are stored and dealt with in an automated database.</p> <p>Non-coding part of DNA: chromosome regions that are not expressed genetically.</p> <p>DNA profile: a letter or number code that represents a set of identification characteristics of the non-coding part of an analysed human DNA sample.</p> <p>Automated searching: an online access procedure for consulting the databases of one, several, or all of the EU countries.</p> <p>Hit/no-hit procedure: in this procedure the parties grant each other limited access to the reference data in their national DNA and fingerprint databases and the right to use these data to conduct automated checks of fingerprints and DNA profiles. The personal information related to the reference data is not available to the requesting party.</p>				

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>SO5 I6: Volume of exchange of information in the Secure Information Exchange Network Application (SIENA) framework</b>				
<p>For the purpose of the Member State evaluations, these indicators have been revised to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of SIENA cases initiated per year by Member States</li> <li>2. Number of SIENA messages exchanged per year by Member States</li> </ol> <p>Cases initiated by Europol and Third Parties are excluded from the data by MS, since data availability impedes their correct attribution to any given MS. The Secure Information Exchange Network Application (SIENA) is a state-of-the-art platform that enables the swift and user-friendly exchange of operational and strategic crime-related information among:</p> <p>Europol’s liaison officers, analysts and experts</p> <p>Member States</p> <p>Third parties with which Europol has cooperation agreements.</p> <p>SIENA ensures the secure exchange of sensitive and restricted information. The SIENA user community includes liaison officers from Member States, seconded national experts and Europol officials at Europol headquarters, officials in the Member State Europol National Units and competent authorities as well as National Contact Points and competent authorities of Third Parties.</p>	Number of cases (1); number of messages (2)	Europol	Annual - Calendar year. Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	Due to availability of data, the baseline is the 2014 calendar year.
<b>SO5 I7: Volume of sharing of data via the Europol Information System (EIS)</b>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of persons and objects inserted in the EIS by Member State per year</li> <li>2. Number of person objects inserted in the EIS by Member State per year (suspects, convicts, potential future criminals)</li> <li>3. Number of EIS searches performed by Member State per year</li> </ol> <p>The Europol Information System (EIS) is Europol’s central criminal information and intelligence database covering all of Europol’s mandated crime areas. It contains serious international crime-related information on suspected and convicted persons, criminal</p>	Number	Europol	Annual - Calendar year. Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.	2013

Specific objective - Crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism ...”				
Definition - Clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
structures, and offences and means used to commit them. It is a reference system which provides Europol and its Member States with a rapid means to verify whether information on a certain person or another object of interest is available beyond national or organisational jurisdictions.				

*SO6: Risk and crisis*

Specific objective - Enhancing the capacity of Member States and the Union for managing effectively security-related risks and crises, and preparing for and protecting people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security-related incidents				
Definition - clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<b>OUTPUT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO6 C2: Number of projects relating to the assessment and management of risks in the field of internal security supported by the Instrument</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex II of Regulation EU 513/2014)	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>				
<b>SO6 R1: Number and tools put in place and/or further upgraded with the help of the Instrument to facilitate the protection of critical infrastructure by Member States in all sectors of the economy</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex II of Regulation EU 513/2014)	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013
<b>SO6 R2: Number of expert meetings, workshops, seminars, conferences, publications, websites and online consultations organised with the help of the Instrument.</b>				
Common indicator for the measurement of the specific objectives (Annex II of Regulation EU 513/2014)  The indicator shall be further broken down in sub-categories such as: 1. Relating to critical infrastructure protection; 2. relating to risk and management.	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year	2013

Specific objective - Enhancing the capacity of Member States and the Union for managing effectively security-related risks and crises, and preparing for and protecting people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security-related incidents				
Definition - clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
IMPACT INDICATORS				
SO6 I1: Volume of terrorist attacks				
<p>a) Number of failed, foiled and completed terroristic attacks</p> <p>b) Number of casualties resulting from terrorist attacks</p> <p>The Framework Decision (2002/475/JHA) and amending Decision (2008/919/JHA) define terrorist offences, as well as offences related to terrorist groups or offences linked to terrorist activities. A new Directive was proposed by the Commission on 3 December 2015.</p> <p>The notion of terrorist offence is a combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— objective elements (murder, bodily injuries, hostage taking, extortion, committing attacks, threat to commit any of the above, etc.); and</li> <li>— subjective elements (acts committed with the objective of seriously intimidating a population, destabilising or destroying structures of a country or international organisation or making a government abstain from performing actions).</li> <li>— A terrorist group as a structured group of two or more persons, established over a period of time and acting in concert to commit terrorist offences.</li> </ul> <p>Data relate to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>—criminal preparatory acts as offences linked to terrorist activities - examples include public provocation to commit a terrorist offence, recruitment and training for terrorism and theft, extortion or forgery with the aim of committing terrorist offences;</li> <li>— criminal inciting or aiding or abetting, as well as attempting to commit certain types of offences;</li> <li>— criminal liability for legal persons and set rules and thresholds for penalties and sanctions;</li> </ul>	Number of attacks; number of deaths.	Europol - EU Terrorism situation and trend report	<p>Calendar year. The report is published in year n with reference to what happened in year n-1.</p> <p>Data recalculated and reported by DG HOME in SFC on a pro rata basis in order to correspond to the financial year.</p>	Due to data availability, the baseline is the 2014 calendar year.

Specific objective - Enhancing the capacity of Member States and the Union for managing effectively security-related risks and crises, and preparing for and protecting people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security-related incidents				
Definition - clarifications	Unit of measurement	Source of Data	Frequency	Baseline
<p><b>Definitions</b></p> <p>Terrorism: In the absence of a generally accepted definition under international law, “terrorism” can be defined as the intentional and systematic use of actions designed to provoke terror in the public as a means to certain ends. Terrorism can be the act of an individual or a group of individuals acting in their individual capacity or with the support of a State. It may also be the act of a State, whether against the population (human rights violations such as forced labour, deportation, genocide, etc.), or in the context of an international armed conflict against the civil population of the enemy State.</p> <p><b>Useful links:</b></p> <p><a href="https://www.europol.europa.eu/activities-services/main-reports/eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report">https://www.europol.europa.eu/activities-services/main-reports/eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report</a></p>				

*Horizontal indicators*

EFFICIENCY - article 55 (3) of the Horizontal Regulation 514/2014					
Number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) in the Responsible Authority, the Delegated Authority and the Audit Authority working on the implementation of ISF and paid by the technical assistance or national budgets as compared to the number of projects implemented and to the amount of the funds claimed for the financial year	If the Authorities are in charge of both AMIF and ISF, the staff should be apportioned.	Number of Full Time Equivalent Number of projects Amount of the Fund	Member States	Annual financial year. –	2013

Technical Assistance (TA) plus the administrative (indirect) cost of projects as compared to the amount of funds claimed for the financial year	<p>Example of indirect costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- costs related to horizontal services, such as administrative and financial management and human resources (e.g. staff);</li> <li>- rents;</li> <li>- communication costs (postage, fax, telephone, mailing, internet connection, telecommunication software, etc.);</li> <li>- office supplies (stationery, photocopies, paper, ink, cartridge, etc.);</li> <li>- office furniture;</li> <li>- standard office IT equipment, (copy machine, projector, beamer, PC, laptop, normal office software, etc.), cameras, video cameras;</li> <li>- maintenance costs;</li> <li>- heating, water supply, electricity or other forms of energy and</li> <li>- insurance policies.</li> </ul>	Number	Member States	Annual – financial year.	2013
Absorption rate of the Fund	Amount of the accounts submitted by the Member State as compared to the total amount of funds allocated to the national programme.	Percentage	SFC	Annual – trend (evolution by year)	2013

SUSTAINABILITY - article 55 (3) of the Horizontal Regulation 514/2014					
Number of equipment in use 2 years after their acquisition / number of equipment acquired under ISF (> than EUR 10.000)		Number	Member States	Annual - financial year.	2013

Share of the maintenance cost of acquired equipment under the Fund in the total Union contribution to actions co-financed by the Fund		Percentage	Member States	Annual - financial year	2013
---	--	------------	---------------	-------------------------	------